

# The Neighborhood Concept: An Evaluation

A thesis submitted by George Kostritsky  
in the partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
Master's Degree in City Planning

August 31, 1952

Department of City and Regional Planning  
School of Architecture and Planning  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, Mass.



Room 14-0551  
77 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
Ph: 617.253.2800  
Email: [docs@mit.edu](mailto:docs@mit.edu)  
<http://libraries.mit.edu/docs>

## **DISCLAIMER**

**Page has been ommitted due to a pagination error  
by the author.**

*pages 98, 112, 127*

3 Walker Terrace  
Cambridge, Mass.  
September 7, 1951

Professor Frederick J. Adams, Chairman  
Department of City and Regional Planning  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Dear Professor Adams:

I transmit herewith two copies of my thesis for the  
Master's degree in City Planning entitled The Neigh-  
borhood Concept: An Evaluation.

Sincerely,

George Kostritsky

**RECEIVED**

SEP 10 1951

**DIVISION OF  
CITY and REGIONAL PLANNING**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i-iii
INTRODUCTION	1-2
NEIGHBORHOOD UNIT THEORY	3-6
SCOPE OF STUDY	7-14
PRIMARY GROUPS	15-20
URBAN CHARACTERISTICS	38-42
SIZE	43-58
MOBILITY	59-71
POPULATION COMPOSITION	72-102
PARTICIPATION	103-130
NEIGHBORHOOD	21-37 (following 130)
CONCLUSIONS	131-139
AREAS OF FUTURE STUDY	140-141
BIBLIOGRAPHY	142-147



## ABSTRACT

The frame of reference of this thesis is bounded by the ideas that were formed by Clarence Perry, moulded by Clarence Stein and practiced by their followers. The original concept defined a neighborhood unit- an area in which community centeredness and safety for children should exist within a homogeneous population grouping. Stein and others have modified the latter condition and thereby modified the validity of the entire concept.

Evidence indicates that primary group orientation as the basis of the neighborhood is overemphasized at the expense of the consideration of the urban environment in its totality. This leads to an atomistic scheme rather than an integration of people into the urban environment. Admittedly there are instances of need for primary group orientation, but it is the extent which is here being questioned.

Perry perceived the neighborhood as an environment of mutual interest, its members having not one but many interests in common. Sociologists including MacIver, advance differing theories describing a community of interests transcending proximity, thus establishing a broader pattern of community solidarity than that inherent in Perry's scheme.

The generic neighborhood of the pre-industrial era, was a result of a pattern of isolation, poor transportation, lack of mobility, a stable population and was characterized by a singleness of purpose and mutual understanding. Atavistic attempts in the present day, however, to reconstruct this previously existing situation seem only deterrents to constructive thought.

The rise of urbanization produced a time rather than a place orientation, resulting in a facilitation of change. Specialization and individualization arose, both in work and in the choice of friends and interests. This fluidity is a factor to be considered in planning, and there is insufficient evidence to prove its undesirability and the need to control it by rigid area planning. The social anomic does exist in our urban areas but it is possible to control this while retaining "open" planning. In addition, this condition applies primarily to the unmarried, who were not the group with which the neighborhood unit concept concerns itself.

The size of a neighborhood unit will vary with the factors being considered, such as school, political unit, shopping area, service area, which do not necessarily exist over the same geographical area. Certain studies tend to indicate that the factor of sociability will define a "social neighborhood" distinct from a physical "neighborhood". Social intercourse follows locational patterns existing in the immediate environment, beyond which it permeates a larger area.

The effect of mobility vertical, horizontal and internal on the social pattern is considered, with particular attention to the possible effects of this on the human personality. Mobility varies with family status and the degree of urbanization, these precluding any generalizations. Its effects vary in different groups and its existence is determined by external forces.

Population composition within the residential environment is of particular importance. The variables determining the types of social interaction include economic, religious, educational and occupational

factors. The coexistence of different levels in these variables will effect social interaction in varying patterns.

## INTRODUCTION

This study attempts to evaluate the neighborhood unit theory and its applicability to urban areas, focusing not on the adequacy of the physical features for resolving physical problems but on its adequacy for serving social needs. The method of approach, or the planning process, is of primary concern, considering the final theory only as it reflects this. It is acknowledged that there is merit in the neighborhood unit theory; however, because of the normative nature of the approach inherent limitations exist. An attempt will be made to define these qualifications by examining certain social considerations which affect physical planning, thus affecting the neighborhood unit theory. The author's thesis is that man must be considered both physically and socially in arriving at a plan for his living, individually and corporately. In theories of neighborhood planning so far advanced emphasis has been on social and physical theory and physical structure. The study of social structure has been omitted. Attention will now be directed toward the human equation, social structure, establishing its importance in guiding and moulding the planners' formulation of physical plans.

The reader should not anticipate the advancing of a new theory. Such is not the purpose of this study. An effort will be made to reconcile the major concept of the planned neighborhood with empirical evidence available on the effect of mobility and hetero-

geneity on group living. The social pattern of groups of different income, education and occupation will be analyzed. The size of a neighborhood will be studied in terms of the various purposes. An attempt will be made to bring into focus the salient factors of neighborhood and urban life, examining the advantages and disadvantages in the light of scientific data made available to us by sociologists. A complete reformulation of the neighborhood is not sought. However, there are serious questions and problems confronting the planner that remain unanswered. They are admittedly perplexing and have no easy solution, but there is a real need for more flexible and adequate conceptual tools with which to approach them. The fashioning of such tools may be the task of a generation.

## NEIGHBORHOOD UNIT THEORY

The scope of this paper has been roughly outlined. The detailed analysis will depart from the concept of the neighborhood as advanced by Clarence Perry.<sup>1</sup> This was a significant study with carefully arrived at physical recommendations for a neighborhood. Because many of the basic formulations and concept, notwithstanding some modifications, form the basis of the planning neighborhood today, it may be without prejudice considered a fair representation of the assumptive form world of the planners today. No scheme, however, desirable it may seem, should be accepted uncritically but the best knowledge available which bears on it must be used to constantly examine it. The findings of the social sciences are not absolute, but relative, changing with environmental, social and scientific changes. Certain basic structures may be found which may help us in building our cities in harmony with men.

The neighborhood unit theory is primarily a physical scheme. But the physical environment affects the social environment, a factor which planners have recognized. Because of this, the theory has profound social implications, considered sufficiently important by Perry to have been carefully outlined by him. As a physical planner he went beyond this, admitting social theory as a major factor in the formulation of the theory. He sought increased primary group, face to face contact, as described by Cooley<sup>2</sup>, as a means of overcoming a certain disorganization which he saw in

- - - -

1-Perry, Clarence A. "Neighborhood and Community Planning" in Regional Survey of New York City and Environs.

2-Cooley, C.H. Social Organization.

urban life. His planning process here became interesting, moving from an observed impression to theoretical generalizations, incorporated into a physical plan. He proposed community-centered inclusive neighborhoods, in which persons would engage in neighboring. "When persons are brought together through the use of common recreational facilities, they come to know one another and friendly relations ensue."<sup>1</sup> He proceeded to prescribe the size of the area in which this would occur, the facilities to be included, the essentials of the physical plan. It is recognized that many of the suggestions resulted from physical considerations, but social and physical problems interact, each affecting the solution of the other.

Perry's contribution to urban planning was indeed significant, even if found to be not always valid. It has been said that hypotheses which are not completely true may be of far greater value to scientific inquiry than those which are irrefutable. It is not doubted that this concept will be successful in many situations, but the author is concerned about certain situations in which it may be a less successful solution than desired, and about the extensiveness of those instances.

The major provisions of the concept concerned size, community centeredness, safety, facilities, pedestrian access, school centeredness and population composition. He considered it best suited to new peripheral areas, although subsequent planners have applied

---

1 - Perry, op.cit., p.215

it to rebuilding urban areas. Initially only families with children were considered but subsequently all groups were provided for.

High speed arteries were regarded as barriers between areas and it was felt that inevitably we would be forced to live in cells in the interstitial spaces. These spaces he considered as ideally being of a half-mile radius, based on pedestrian access to all points within a fifteen minute time interval. They would be physically distinct and identifiable, either arrived at by the use of natural or artificially constructed barriers. Arterials would not pass through them, since their ideal spacing made them coincide with the boundaries.

They would be elementary school and community center oriented, which together would serve as the focus of the neighborhood. The auditorium, gymnasium and library of the school, as well as certain other rooms, could be used for civic, cultural and recreational activities. "With such equipment, and an environment possessing so much of interest and service to all residents, a vigorous local consciousness would be bound to arise." In the neighborhood community center a branch public library, indoor recreational activities, and facilities for social clubs would be provided.

The size in terms of population was seemingly based on the number of persons necessary to most economically support an elementary school. It would vary between five and ten thousand persons.



The composition of the population would be homogeneous (undefined). He was much impressed by Forest Hills as a neighborhood and ascribed much of its success in displaying "neighborliness" to the careful selection of congenial owners. Subsequent planners, including Clarence Stein, have advocated a heterogeneity of population to achieve greater variety. Since this is a major reformulation its effect on the plan will be examined carefully.

The resulting social pattern would enable the full and healthy development of the whole personality. The basis of community life would arise directly from the physical plan.<sup>1</sup> The primary group would establish a form of social control which he considered an essential element in planned morality and group mores. Many of the physical provisions are sound, particularly those related to safety. Yet even safety need not be found solely in a neighborhood unit.

- - - - -

1 - Perry, op.cit., p.243

## SCOPE OF THE STUDY

### Primary Group

The provisions of the concept themselves point to the areas for scientific social investigation. This study is organized to focus first on the primary group, attempting to determine under what conditions it will develop and what its role is, in various groups of people, how this varies with such factors as income, occupation and education, and how technological advances in transportation and communication have affected it.

It is hypothesized that primary group contacts do not necessarily involve proximity contacts; as a result of this they may occur in widely different areas. This will be more or less true depending on other characteristics of the groups studied.

Some people desire a life based on a selective type of association, (unbonded), with the result that their social intercourse pattern may be fluid and comprehensive; this will alter the focus from a primary group centered neighborhood and lessen the strength of associations based on proximity. However, there are also men, within the diverse fabric of the city, who desire to retain strong primary group, face to face associations, while also participating in selective associations. It is imperative to understand the institutions or neighborhood pattern which will furnish this primary group contact. Another group of yet differing needs also exists. Those families, who because of children or for whatever other

reason, are deprived of mobility, show a need and desire for strong primary group contact. These needs must be met, or alternatively, a larger radius of mobility made possible for them.

### Neighborhood

The constituent elements of neighborhoods will be examined since it is neighborhoods with which we are concerned. The effect of urbanization on group living, the importance of group composition are areas for study. The polar attraction of larger, more centralized facilities may materially affect the use of facilities which exist closer in space, though not in time. This will bear on the planned pedestrian transportation. It seems clearly evident that high speed arterials will exist as barriers to pedestrians, at least to some extent, but this is a major barrier only when the major form of transportation is pedestrian. Corbusier's notion of elevated arterials would minimize even this: the sections below the traffic arterials could be used for areas of social contact, not barriers. It is also apparent that arterials can serve as access ways, carrying people to places distant from residence for such purposes as social contact, education, recreation and shopping. We question how people neighbor and the area over which this extends? How selective is this or is proximity the prime factor? Does this vary? If so, with what factors?

It has been observed that distance from central city is correlated positively with the development of those characteristics which we describe as indicative of neighborhood. This is a natural result

isolation and varies in intensity with the ease and cost of transportation. It is, therefore, hypothesized that neighborhood becomes increasingly desirable as the distance from the central city increases.

### Urban Environment

As the neighborhood cannot be considered separate from the city, we must look also at the effect of the urban environment on neighborhood living. The specialization of the city, the diversity of its facilities, its interdependence may well have been reflected in the social patterns established.

### Size

The size of the unit was predicated on (a) population size to support an economic school as suggested by Engelhardt, which would also serve as the community center<sup>1</sup>(b) maximum allowable walking distance for pedestrian access to all points<sup>2</sup>(c) distance between major arterials, stated to be 3000 feet<sup>3</sup>(d) adequacy to develop a distinctive character, defining it from other areas.

Examining each point separately we may ask whether this size was also best for the psychical growth of the child; should economic considerations govern as we postulate the ideal neighborhood? Is this a sound base or is it subject to change with changing theories of education? The disciples of John Dewey continue firm in their advocacy of small schools, which they feel necessary for

1 - Perry, op.cit., p.47.

2 - Perry, Clarence A. Housing for the Machine Age. p.48

3- Perry, op.cit., p.52

the maximum development of the child and essential for his security. If the population is immobile will the child population not vary greatly from year to year?

The coexistence of parochial and public schools may affect the social relations of children which could in turn modify the community center aspect of the school? Would such coexistence affect the size of the neighborhood? An area supporting only a public school of the sixty rooms recommended by Engelhardt as the economical size is a different size than that which is equally divided between support of a parochial and public school?

An area in which the high income group is represented may also be supporting a private school, since this group is selective of their children's schools as they are of other facilities.

The ability of the school to serve as a community center, and thus a neighborhood focus is questioned by some school administrators who point out that an elementary school is ill-adapted to use by adults since all design and furnishings are scaled to the child.

The location of a school within a neighborhood at all times is a point bearing verification. Since it has been suggested that in certain areas of the city, provision of rural school locations may provide the healthiest child environment, with farm animals, forests, etc. This is currently being tried in Oxford, England.

Basing size on pedestrian access may be a valid point in certain instances. However, the need for and desirability of this may vary with the mobility of the population.

The distance between major arterials is not an absolute quality, but will vary with any increase or decrease in use of automobiles, advance of air transportation, increased use of subways or public transportation, and distance from central city.

The desire for definition of the area from surrounding areas seems difficult to substantiate or refute. It appears an aesthetic consideration, but certainly not a determinant of size. No area or building exists out of context, the house is part of the context of the neighborhood, and the neighborhood a part of the adjoining neighborhood and of the city.

These are all physical considerations of size. The author suggests social considerations. He submits that neighborhood size will vary with population composition, and that the size of the "social and use of facilities" neighborhood may differ markedly from that of the school district neighborhood, and that overlapping of social, physical, interest, use of facilities, school and recreation neighborhoods will occur.

The size of the area of primary associations has been considered. Evidence has indicated that the area of neighboring, where it exists, is small. The theory is, therefore, advanced that where

neighborhood planning for primary association is desirable, the size can be small.

The size of a neighborhood is a function of its purposes and will vary with the social pattern of its inhabitants.

### Mobility

Mobility of people and of ideas is a characteristic of our age, available in varying degrees to various people. It has widened the range of man's interests and has increased his freedom, allowing for greater selectivity. It, too, may affect the way in which men live and the needs and desires which they have. Its extent, the reasons for, benefits and disadvantages, possible reduction as a result of neighborhood, must all be studied.

The author has not found data indicating that planned neighborhoods tend to diminish the mobility of residents. Until such studies are made we cannot justify the neighborhood as an instrument in the reduction of mobility. Such studies would have to distinguish, in the stable population, between those whose previous tendency was immobility, and those who previously tended to mobility, and presumably would have continued this pattern. Only this latter group could be used in such a study.

Evidence indicates that a high degree of mobility renders strong residential area ties much less effectual. It is advanced that the greatest interest of mobile city dwellers will be in institutions chosen selectively and not resulting from proximity.

### Population Composition

The effectiveness of the neighborhood unit must be evaluated in terms of the composition of the urban population. The heterogeneity and homogeneity of populations seems an important issue because of the divergence of views of Perry and subsequent advocates of the unit. Such a reformulation may affect other aspects of the theory, to wit, will a neighborhood function as effectively and cohesively for a heterogeneous as for a homogeneous population? How does this affect size? Is a larger group necessary for the support of the separate facilities needed for groups of varying interests and needs?

It has been observed that the heterogeneity of the urban population, in terms of income, background, education, mores, customs, language, ethnic group or interests has fostered homogeneous groupings. The theory is advanced that the intensity of this heterogeneity increases the probability that strong neighborhood ties, centered around place of residence, will not occur unless a crucial, and as yet undetermined, degree of homogeneity coexists with place of residence.

The spatial distribution of locality or neighborhood facilities to be provided is a function of the population composition and will vary with income, education, occupation and family status.



### Participation

Our major concern remains with the social base of a community centered neighborhood. To determine the community aspect, it is necessary to study the participation pattern of people, its intensity and frequency of participation. What are the interests of people and how do they vary? How important is income? education? How pervasive is class or social stratification? How selective are people? How important is proximity? All of this bears on the use of community facilities and on the community centeredness of a neighborhood.

It is hypothesized that participation patterns of people will vary widely and that selectivity and mobility will lessen the use of community facilities in many instances. The area of support of local facilities may be a wider area than that proposed for a neighborhood. Specialization of interest will increase the tendency toward special interest use of local facilities. Groups widely divergent in income, occupation and education will also have widely different interests and activities, making the likelihood of joint participation in the same activities of a heterogeneous neighborhood highly unlikely.

We will now turn to a more detailed study of these problems in an attempt to answer some of the questions which have arisen.

## PRIMARY GROUPS

Since primary groups constitute one form of man's social intercourse pattern, their characteristics and location are important for planners. Cities should facilitate social interaction, providing for its fullest expression. Obstacles should not be erected nor should plans be misdirected, seeking to fulfill misunderstood needs and desires.

In Perry's classical formulation of the neighborhood unit plan, the social structure sought drew heavily on Cooley's concept of the primary group; social planning was based on the need for strengthened primary group contact of a face to face kind, which would arise naturally from common use of facilities. Cooley defined a primary group as an intimate group, the intimacy covering a considerable period and resulting in a habitual sympathy, the mind of each being filled with a sense of the mind of the others so that the group as a whole is the chief sphere of the social self for each individual in it of emulation, ambition, resentment, loyalty, etc. Cooley viewed human nature as not something existing separately in the individual but a group nature or primary phase of society. Having accepted this view, the neighborhood unit theory resulted in a community-centered plan, where considerations of proximity took precedence over concern for selectivity, and where unity of the group was planned for.

MacIver in commenting on face to face groups, identified them as

the clearest illustration of simple or direct cooperation, wherein men did the same thing together, in contrast to complex or indirect cooperation, a characteristic of urban life, wherein men did different things interdependently.<sup>1</sup>

There are certain distinct benefits inherent in small group associations. Fawcett noted that men need to be members of a comparatively small group, and that to have too many neighbors was in effect to have none, since the large group soon passed beyond the limits of easy and effective social intercourse, and comprehension for the average man and woman.<sup>2</sup> However, within no matter how large a group, one's "neighbors" or social contacts are few, hence each person selectively or unselectively, depending on his physical location and social desires and capabilities, creates his own small social group. One does not know, in any personal sense, more than a small number of other individuals, although one may have much in common with a very large group, up to the whole of mankind.

One should bear in mind the tendency toward "consensus" or "group nature" in small groups and realize the power of an individual within such a group, as found by Krzywicki. In a study of small residential areas he noted that the exceptional individual whether good or bad, radical or conservative, peaceful or warlike, ascetic or sensuous, evenly balanced or neurotic, left marked traces of his individuality on the life of the group. We must carefully

1 - MacIver, R.M. Community: A Sociological Study, p.10

2 - Fawcett, C.B. A Residential Unit for Town and Country Planning.

weigh the benefits to the individual of the small group against this tendency of domination by exceptional individual before deciding that small groups must be strengthened in residential areas.

Face to face group contact sufficed for most purposes where life was simple, as in a primitive community or frontier settlement, or where the area of effective communication was small. However, MacIver observed that where society expands another kind of association becomes necessary which is the large scale association with the impersonal relationships and its specialization of functions.<sup>1</sup>

Hawley's writing confirms this. He noted that in relatively isolated self-sufficient population, where the universe was small and there was little specialization, one individual was much like another and all were uniformly subordinated to the group. However, as the sphere of life expanded and the aggregate became highly differentiated, the individual acquired a distinction and measure of freedom, indicating a certain ascendancy over the group in which he was a member. Individuals, however, did not overcome their dependency but shifted it onto a widely scattered group.<sup>2</sup>

If we pursue the impact of technology on primary groups we distinguish a potential face to face group in which each member can be easily in another's presence. The chief distinction is "may" rather than "must". Technology has given to the primary group, as it has to employment, place of residence, recreation, etc.

a freedom of choice, an opportunity for differentiation. The

1 - Tannebaum, J. "The Neighborhood: A Socio-Psychological Analysis".

2 - Hawley, Amos H. Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure.

primary group continues to exist, though it is not limited to a group of people who necessarily are in continuous face to face association through all of their lives.

It is the large scale associations with the impersonal relationships and the specialization of functions which characterize our twentieth century life. As a result of the inability to adjust to change, there are writers such as Pertzoff who proclaim "We are totally incapable as individuals of coping with the overwhelming assault of the myriad issues of daily life in the city. It is impossible to become conscious of one's responsibilities because the number of people is too large to be grasped as an imaginable reality by any mind. Hence the flight from reality, the characteristic of our time."<sup>1</sup> This statement may be true or only an outburst of emotionalism? In any event, how do we overcome such feeling? It is a negative move and overlooks Hawley's explanation that individuals continue their dependency on a group but that the group is now chosen selectively. It is true that twentieth century urban man is exposed to increased secondary, impersonal contacts. It does not follow, however, that his primary contacts are reduced. They may not follow the previously existent pattern of occurring in the immediately adjacent area, but one cannot conclude therefore that if they do not occur in the same place they do not occur.

### Conclusion

It thus becomes possible to recognize the dependency of an individual on a group without necessarily assembling that group in close proximity.

1 - Pertzoff, Herman and Pertzoff, Erma. "An Organic Theory of City Planning" Architectural Forum, April 1944, pp.133-140.

mity to him. This allows freer planning and changes the frame of reference in which to work, calling for a different orientation and approach. The advance of communication had made this possible.

It is also possible to satisfy the needs of any group whose need is continuous face to face contact, who are bound to one place, lacking mobility, without assembling a large group, or neighborhood around him, for we have seen that the primary group is small. For the child in particular the face to face contact group remains quite small. We see no obstacle to his carrying on his play group relationships, within or without a physically or socially oriented neighborhood, assuming that the facilities needed are properly provided. It is not five to ten thousand people needed for any group. This size may be necessary for other purposes but for the satisfaction of man's need for a primary group it is not indicated. Sociologists have furnished planners with evidence that a large primary group is not essential to the development of an adequate personality.

There is indication from the evidence that for some people a primary group association close to place of residence is necessary and that for some people primary group satisfactions do not occur there. However, for neither is a neighborhood necessary. The social areas seemingly necessary are small, immediately adjacent, from which the transition is to the city as a whole. By indicating this second category, the city as a whole, we do not mean that certain close-by facilities will not be used. We do, however, suggest that

ties will be less strong than those planned for in the isolated neighborhood, and that more inclusive planning should encompass a larger area. Community-centeredness is not important to all groups under all circumstances. These social considerations will affect the form and distribution of facilities of residential areas.

## NEIGHBORHOOD

Neighborhood, or community, which term is synonymous with the neighborhood which Perry understood and advocated was described by MacIver<sup>1</sup> as <sup>follows:</sup> "any circle of people who live together, who belong together so that they share, not this or that particular interest, but a whole set of interests wide enough and complete enough to include their lives, is a community." It is interesting that there is no quantitative factor in this definition.

He continued, and contrasted an organism and a community, serving to clarify his views of the latter. "An organism", he wrote, "has a single center, a unity of life, a purpose or a consciousness which is no purpose or consciousness or the several parts but only of the whole. A community consists of myriad centers of life and consciousness, of true autonomous individuals who are merged in no such corporate unity, whose purposes are lost in no such corporate purpose. A community does not act in unity like an organism."<sup>2</sup> It is thus MacIver who sees in the community differentiation - not the singleness which Cooley saw. MacIver developed this further, stating that whereas associations were partial, and members of one association could be members of other distinct associations, the community was integral, having within it numerous and antagonistic associations. Thus the community, or neighborhood, may be composed of many diverse parts. It may encompass also the city if it is possible to engender this spirit in that area. Its characteristics are not confined to any physical area.

1 - MacIver, op.cit., p.73.

2 - ibid., p.73.



In an attempt to develop an understanding of the term we have dealt with basic theoretical meanings. Planning, however, considers the secondary, attributive expressions of this group relationship. Chief among these is social participation. The criteria of the neighborhood of social participation are of two types, one the realm of personal relations, the making of friends and individuals relationships within a group, while the other concerns participation in groups or organizations. We shall attempt to distinguish the characteristics of each.

#### Generic Neighborhood

The neighborliness (neighboring, visiting, mutual aid and cooperation) which characterizes our generic neighborhood is that with which we are most familiar, and that which was most prevalent prior to 1900. Our heritage is the rural community, or neighborhood, wherein residents were united by strong bonds. These bonds did not occur simply because of residence in the same place, this being incidental to the major cause. They arose due to such factors as isolation, poor transportation, lack of mobility and stable population producing a tradition - traditional mores, accepted standards, common modes of speaking, use of same facilities. In many cases occupations centered around agriculture, or one type of work predominated, thus making one factor important to the economy of all inhabitants. These were chiefly one nationality towns and heterogeneity was at a minimum. Within them elaborate stratification systems arose but it is possible to say that community of differentiated parts existed, the differentiation, however, not being extreme.

Since neighborliness and the making of friends has historically been associated with a neighborhood, we have come to accept it as an integral part of it. However, the manifestations of a true neighborhood may change as social customs change, and true neighborhood can exist without always being present in the same form.

If, on the other hand, our definition of a neighborhood includes this quality, we may find neighborhoods increasingly rare, for the social activities of people are changing. If there is increased personal contact or decreased group participation of individuals in neighborhoods, we should not regard this as conclusive evidence of the effect of the neighborhood, but must look to the people who constitute that particular neighborhood for the cause. We should also not interpret this to mean lack of neighborhood; it may only indicate that the physical and social neighborhoods are no longer coextensive. Overgeneralizations are dangerous. We should seek to find the constituent elements. As Merton<sup>1</sup> so aptly said: "Such findings are precisely on the plane of finding empirically that quinine is a specific for malaria." What are the structures and processes which lead to this? Are they the emergency of common purposes, which can be only achieved collectively? nominal participation under pressure exerted by local group or groups?

### Social Organization

The organization of social life is determined by and large by the interrelationship between two factors: convenience and selectivity. These factors may be greatly modified by economic, technological,

1 - Merton, R.K. "The Social Psychology of Housing" in Current Trends in Social Psychology.

cultural and biological influences, and their relative weight may vary greatly for different functions. A satisfactory balance and an understanding of this process is necessary in considering "ecological" and "sociometric" factors. A careful distinction must be made between (1) activity likely to be shaped directly by factors of proximity or convenience and thus to be provided within some definite geographical limit and (2) activities in which personal selectivity or special interest is more likely to dominate ecological factors, and which, therefore, may or may not take place within a given area.

Improved means of transportation meant a broader and more varied pattern of social life, encouraging individual selectivity in friends and a freer kind of personal development. The trend away from localized and small, parochial communities developed. This characteristic process of urbanization was hostile to the preservation of neighborhood life in that it promoted a high degree of population density, low rate of permanency of residence and considerable heterogeneity of population. An intricate network of secondary group associations formed, tending to break down primary group spirit. The associate community replaced the federate, rural locality group. As the communities grew larger there was a distinct deepening of symbolic abstraction, replacing direct participation and sensing. Whereas in small, isolated population groups we have seen that consensus or, as Spencer<sup>1</sup> said, "mechanical solidarity" prevailed, with group members held together by their likeness from

which they derived mutual support and in which unity was a matter of simple cohesion, this was superseded by organic solidarity with increase in social density. Differentiation developed and interdependence involved specialists to an increasing extent. Unity became that of cooperation among divided parts, rather than "consensus".

Social density is a term of Durkheim's<sup>1</sup>, distinguished from physical density. The latter refers to the ratio of population to land area, while the former pertains to the frequency of contacts and interchange among the members of a population. Thus an aggregate might have a high physical density but a very low social density. In order that organization may progress with population growth beyond the limits set by a few hundred there must be an increase in the social density, or an increase in the frequency and range of human contacts. This can be achieved, he felt, only through the facilitation of movement of individuals and ideas, not through establishing a direct relation between physical and social density in the same area.

### Purpose

The neighborhood unit concept had a fundamental purpose. A means was sought to allow the "forming of the social nature and ideals of the individual".<sup>1</sup> These qualities historically developed and were apparent in the neighborhood. Some planners concluded that

this justified neighborhood planning in our effort to foster the growth of these highly desirable qualities. More cautious thinking,

1 - Durkheim, Emile. Suicide: A Study in Sociology. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1945.

however, shows that these grew historically in the neighborhood since man grew historically in the neighborhood. The more basic question is can they grow in another environment, or is the neighborhood essential for this growth today?

The neighborhood was to have still another *raison d'etre*. Certain effects of our present, impersonal life, are known. Tannebaum<sup>1</sup> reported on the anomic society, characterized by weak group integration and a lack of cohesion among members of the collectivity. She referred to the work of Durkheim and his description of a mass society of people who felt they did not belong. Such people were characteristic of city life, and among them the suicide rate was much higher than elsewhere. They did not feel the existence of a group and thus were forced to rely solely on themselves.

Durkheim found that in societies having a strong group feeling there was a low suicide or anomic rate. From this he concluded that group support seems the strongest factor making for security in the individual.

From this evidence, many planners have concluded that for the mental well-being of our citizens, stronger primary groups serve an important role in providing for the sense of power and prestige of the individual as contrasted with the mass neurosis existing in the absence of "community". This conclusion bears further study, however, in terms of the type of people in cities who suffer most keenly from the neuroses described. It seems likely that unmarried men and women would be among the group with least ego support; hence our neighborhoods, reestablished, should in large measure be

1 - Tannebaum, op.cit.

directed toward their needs, if this purpose is to be best served, whereas they are for the most part "family-with-child" oriented in the plans so far submitted.

### Urban characteristics

Urban living has called for a new frame of reference and the ability to receive total satisfaction from it has demanded adjustment. The city represents a supreme example of cooperation and dependence of people on each other. Cantril has stated "The interdependence that follows in the wake of technological advance requires the abstractions and symbols men use to bind them to each other in larger social and institutional groupings must become more and more abstract as the range of their inclusiveness broadens and must, at the same time, having meaning for individuals in terms of their own purposive actions."<sup>1</sup>

The ability of the neighborhood to overcome such features of urban living as specialization of activities, social contacts, recreation can be seriously questioned, and its merit requires substantive proof. Our real problem may well be the integration of man into the larger whole, rather than efforts to integrate man into these smaller units. The latter may be the easier but the former may hold forth the promise of limitless opportunities for growth and new achievements. Careful study is needed before we can conclude that loss of identification is a result of urban life, and we must be cautious not to treat the symptoms, but search for the underlying ill. Certainly we cannot determine the method of treatment until

1 - Cantril, Hadley. The "Why" of Man's Experience, p.146.

we have considered the alternatives: strengthen the selective associational pattern, so that it will be more inclusive, or seek to strengthen the federate, multibonded primary group contact. This latter course must be considered as beneficial to what portion of the population and disadvantageous to what portion. We can, perhaps, conclude that it is possible that some people bound to cities seek the latter. It is possible to provide this without establishing it as a pattern for the city at large. Both unbonded and multibonded associations can exist in the city if they are desired.

We must guard against judging urban life by rural values, and judging twentieth century life by nineteenth century values. It is quite possible that twentieth century urban man derives as much, though a different type of satisfaction from his environment as did nineteenth century rural man and suffers no more frustrations or unrest than did his predecessor. Diamond<sup>1</sup> raised the question of whether the symptoms of disorganization we see in the city are the result of the city or are characteristic of our times, first observed in the city, but spreading rapidly to the country.

Is it not, perhaps, the task of the new social education to prepare man to function effectively in the larger communities? Brownell's view is that the characteristic pattern of change would be a continuous extension of membership due to changes in economy, transportation and communication, probably a deepening of symbolic significance and a tendency toward less direct participation in the group by the individual. As the group gets bigger, and as individual participation

+ - - - -  
 1 - Diamond, Walter. "On the Dangers of an Urban Interpretation of History" in Historiography and Urbanization, p.106.

becomes less direct, it becomes deeper and richer.<sup>1</sup>

We may conclude that, however much we may idealize the values of the social solidarity of the generic neighborhood the fact remains that our social order has changed profoundly from the organic life of the old hamlet or village societies. Mechanisms are developed; processes must be transformed from conscious and voluntary to habitual and involuntary; and individuals and parts must cooperate without physical awareness of each other. We must begin to deal with the phenomena we have which is the larger community with its multi-nucleated pattern unlike its predecessor.

### Case Studies

We should look to existing neighborhoods for evidence of their organization, disorganization or disintegration and factors which have affected this. We have attempted to reach an understanding of social theory; social structure must also be understood, for which empirical evidence is necessary.

#### Criteria of Neighborhood

McKenzie<sup>1</sup>, in his classic study of neighborhoods in Columbus, found neighborhood sentiment associated with (1) physical differentiations by natural or artificial boundaries (2) homogeneity and stability of population (3) limitation of area and number of families. He further found that in low economic areas mutual aid occurs chiefly between relatives. Such aid had almost ceased between neighbors. Proximity to the center of town determined the extent of use of

local facilities, with increasing reliance on local facilities and

1 - McKenzie, R.D. The Neighborhood: A Study of Local Life in the City of Columbus.



accordingly increasing cohesiveness the farther removed the area was from the center. The implication for planning is profound, pointing to increased need for neighborhood facilities as the distance from the central city increases and increased possibility of neighborhood planning; conversely this <sup>de</sup>creases as the distance from the central city decreases.

#### Lack of Neighborhood

Roper studied seven physical neighborhoods in Hyde Park, finding evidence of only two social neighborhoods. He noted that children associated at school, but this did not bring their parents into direct contact. The two areas near the university possessed many of the characteristics of neighborhood life as we are accustomed to think of it, but in each district the inhabitants were too numerous and their natural contacts too few to make possible more than a rather vague sense of neighborhood<sup>1</sup>. From this study Queen<sup>2</sup> inferred that high economic status and superior physical conditions facilitate but do not guarantee neighboring. Neighborhoods, he concluded, are essentially matters of folkways and traditions, rather than of economics and architecture. This is interesting but evidence from other sources tends to disagree. Folkways and traditions may arise in a neighborhood if the composition of the group is such that a unity exists.

#### Urban Neighborhood

A significant study was made of an urban neighborhood in Greenwich Village<sup>3</sup>. The Village had a heterogeneous population composed of an Irish and Italian migrant population and a group of newcomers, drawn from the intellectual class, known as the Villagers.

<sup>1</sup> - Queen, Stuart and Thomas, L.F. The City, p.300.

<sup>2</sup> - Queen, Stuart and Thomas, L.F. The City, p.300.

<sup>3</sup> - Ware, Catherine. Greenwich Village, 1820-1930.

The most culturally cohesive group was the Irish population which had made its own distinctive adaptation to American city life a generation before. That adaptation rested on the maintenance of their own basic cultural institutions, including the Catholic Church.

In spite of the fact that it has long been the presumption that living nearby makes people into neighbors, bringing them together and giving them, in spite of personal differences, a common point of view, this was not the case in the Village; first and foremost a neighborhood did not necessarily involve the practice of "neighboring". The Villagers, or immigrants from other areas, drawn largely from the intellectual class, considered themselves a group united in a common mode of living, which was the desire to exclude neighboring. Yet this factor united them into a neighborhood as we have seen by previous definitions.

Next in importance was the fact that the juxtaposition of diverse elements had led to the disintegration of a cohesive neighborhood. The evidence of this study indicated that where such characteristics or urbanism exist as they did here, for example mobility, rapid transit, radio, press, the neighborhood very largely ceases to be a basis for social intercourse and a formative influence on the lives of the residents. Only selectively did neighbors know each other, identify themselves with the neighborhood and engage in common activity, either formally or informally. Connection with friends and relatives who had formerly lived in the locality gave them a

metropolitan outlook. Women were usually acquainted with people in the neighboring houses, but were quite as likely to know people from the area whom they met in the markets as to know people on their own block.

The various forms of commercial entertainment did their part to break down the old ways in which the neighborhood used to spend its leisure and to shift the focus of people's thoughts. Increasingly neighborliness became an accompaniment of a low-income level. Those who could afford little commercial amusement were forced to get from each other as much recreation as possible, from gossiping on the stoops or from exchanging news in the cafes. With increased prosperity the number forced to rely on the neighborhood for their amusements was reduced.

This tends to substantiate McKenzie's study in which he found neighborhood associated with homogeneity and stability of the population. The heterogeneity existing here was extreme, representing opposite poles in the grouping of social classes. Therefore, the failure of this group to become cohesive is not conclusive evidence that cohesive neighborhoods must be homogeneous. It is possible that less extreme heterogeneity would not result in the same failure. As McKenzie found, the pull of the central city was sufficiently great to diminish local life. The implications of this have been discussed.

## Rural Neighborhood

An evolutionary study was made of Hertford, a town of 14,000 in the Greater London orbit. In the study of the social structure of this town, it was found that it is no longer the fairly defined social entity that it was. A generation ago it could have been studied in comparative isolation, not influenced by the greater society, with the majority of its daily processes effected within its boundaries. It was an organic whole. The economic structure of the town was closely linked with local and regional markets. The social structure was highly integrated and stable. Each group within it was in some sense a function of the whole. The cultural processes, though expressing many ideals and attitudes engendered in the greater society, were worked out on the plane of the local and the personal. Prestige attached to individuals who were known personally and imitated directly.

As the town became less isolated individuals also became less dependent on the immediate locality for friends. Neighborhood was undermined by this increased mobility, for the geographical range of normal social contacts was extended to a point where it was no longer possible to speak of neighborhoods. Locality as a factor impinging on society was to some extent transcended. The recent rapid growth of space-time minimizing investments extended very considerably the range of personal contacts.

It may be argued that perhaps Hertford did not have the type of facilities envisioned for the new neighborhood, but it must be

borne in mind that a group of 10000 has an upper limit of facilities that can be provided, and ~~it~~<sup>is</sup> quite possible that people desire this mobility, rather than being forced to it for lack of proximity to facilities. In the face of such evidence concerning destruction of an existing, cohesive group by changed facilities, it is difficult to predict success for the movement to reestablish generic neighborhoods or to justify such a movement., until there is more control of the variables.

#### Housing Estate

The history of the development of Watling<sup>1</sup>, a housing estate in England, thirty miles from London, is significant. The population was relatively homogeneous economically and occupationally. In the early days of settlement there was much corporate life, stemming from a desire for amenities which were lacking and from the animosity of the surrounding townspeople. Antagonism from without bred association from within. Subsequently, growth of the estate led inevitably to greater differentiation of opinion among its inhabitants; administering of the amenities led to dissension among the population. The various sections broke off to become self-contained. The estate was so close to London, that it continued to draw much on London, without developing any real town sense itself. The population increased, enabling branches of established parties and societies to form. Partisanship and rivalries began to mark the social life. In the early days the major difficulties were common to all, but after adjustment was made to the environment, people became acutely aware of their in-

1 - Durant, Ruth. Watling: A Social Survey.

dividual worrrries. After the first major influx of population, immigration became subject to vacancies only and problems of adjustment were individual, and their soluti ns extremely in-  
dividualistic. The Roman Catholic congregation on the Estate became self-contained. The spiritual and social needs of its members were met by the church, who represented large faillies with little money, unable to afford other leisure activities, and their attachment to the church tended to be exclusive. The heterogeneity of an economically homogeneous population is indicated. The differing ability of various factors to integrate a neighborhood is interesting; common problems united the group whereas common interests were not sufficient, but resulted in specialized groups.

Bruner<sup>1</sup> studied the town of Greenville, South Carolina, with a population of 60,000, and found that there were few natural communities in cities that possess enoughccommon interest or other integrating factors to foster community spirit; leadership in a city of the size of Greenville was city-wide and neighborhood problems were not recognized. Here the community encompassed the city; it is possible that in urban centers areas of this size may constitute the neighborhood; the intermediary between family and city.

The Middlesbrough study <sup>2</sup> showed that the poorer, the more uniform and the mœre isolated a neighborhood, the more community spirit it was likely to show. Indices were drawn up of geographical isolation,

uniformity of social class, wealth or poverty, quality of schools,

1 - Bruner, E.S. Community Organization and Adult Education: A Five Year Experiment, p. 115.

2 - Glass, Ruth. Social Background of a Plan: Study of Middlesbrough.

shops and other social equipment and the extent to which life in each of the city's neighborhoods was self-contained. It was found that the degree of social integration was highest in the uniformly working class districts. All the districts with a high index of spirit were of very poor social equipment and facilities. The size of the neighborhood mattered less than might be assumed, for both the most and least integrated neighborhoods had very varied population totals.

We must be cautious in using this evidence, however; we cannot conclude that poor social equipment, homogeneity or lower economic and social status produces "social integration" or "neighborhood". This is superficial evidence and the underlying causative factor must be segregated. The other considerations are probably descriptive and symptomatic. They may be contributory. In combination they may produce this result. It is not these factors alone, but the effects which they had in imposing certain limitations on social living which resulted in these effects.

We may conclude that the indices of "neighborhood cohesiveness" differ as one studies various types of neighborhoods. The more valuable and basic index may well be the degree of ego satisfaction which the individual received from the group, the degree to which the neighborhoods offered group support to the individual and fulfilled his primary social needs. Such criteria as "cohesiveness" may not necessarily be useful in determining the success of neighborhoods of various types.

Madge<sup>1</sup>, the British sociologist and social planner for the new town of Stevenage, realized the limitation of the neighborhood of 10,000 persons when he wrote: "We should perhaps try to learn the possible advantages of the somewhat straggling life of the peripheries and having learned them, cultivate them in places where a degree of straggle is inevitable. It may turn out, however, that rather too much has been claimed for the social identity of so large a concentration when it is part of a larger town and when industry and the main town center with its shops are elsewhere. This is not to say that a neighborhood of 10,000 will have no local flavor at all, but it may not be very strong. The moral is that if you want markedly to subdivide the sense of local identity, within a concentration of, say, 30,000, you will probably have to use the work place as the main focus for local subdivision. The primary school, the local shopping center, the local church, will probably not be a strong enough focus in themselves: in any case, they may serve smaller populations than the "neighborhood" of 10,000 people."

- - - - -

1 - Madge, John. "Planning for People". Town Planning Review, July 1950.



## URBAN CHARACTERISTICS

Much of our planning is necessarily going to be concerned with urban areas; this constitutes the frame of reference of this paper. It is, therefore, necessary to understand the major forces inherent in the urban form of life as it affects the social life of its inhabitants.

Examining rural communities, particularly those engaged in profit from agricultural products, or those existing before the advance of transportation, we find a characteristic immobility. This resulted in a degree of stability and self-sufficiency. Isolation served to preserve these qualities. Strong attachments to place arose. Over time certain distinct customs developed which served to bind the population together. Habit became a deterrent to change. Together this produced a life markedly different from that which subsequently evolved in the city.

With the rise of technology came coalescence of great population centers. In addition to a difference in size, other differences distinguished urban areas from their rural predecessors.

First, and certainly noteworthy, is the time rather than place orientation. The city became a center of movement and social relationships increasingly showed evidence of a basis in time rather than place. Whereas orientation toward place had meant an established, change-resistant pattern of life, orientation toward time grew to mean constant change and action in the direction of change.

The great increase in mobility had far reaching social significance. The moving about of people, whether from one city to another or to different "neighborhood" in the same city, vastly increased the number of social contacts and made possible a greater number of stimulations, thus creating conditions favorable to social change.

Specialization arose as cities grew. Some implications of its value are questionable, but it should not be rejected without an attempt to foresee what this rejection would entail. There are few men today who have the abilities of Leonardo da Vinci - architect, planner, painter and engineer. The movement from and before his time has been toward greater specialization. Backward glances have deterred progress toward the true expression of our age as we have sought to pattern it after other ages. We must capture the essence of our predecessors, not the forms. Man is not today less a person because of his complexity. Work, leisure and social contacts have become specialized as people have had freedom of choice. MacIver has pointed out that specialization grows in direct ratio to the size of the city. He continued "Often it is said that evolution is a process of differentiation, and integration, but the term differentiation, properly understood, means integration. In a society it manifests itself in such ways as the following: (a) a greater division of labor so that the energy of more individuals is concentrated on more specific tasks, and so that there is a more elaborate system of cooperation, a more intricate nexus of functional relationships sustained within the group (b) an increase in

the number and variety of functional associations and institutions so that each is more defined or more limited in the range or character of its services and (c) a greater diversity and refinement in the instruments of social communication".<sup>1</sup>

Some idea of the complexity of the city can be gained from figures on Chicago. Of 1,000,000 individuals employed, 509 occupations were reported. "From this multiplicity of groups, with their different patterns of life, the person finds his congenial social world, and, what is not feasible in the narrow confines of a village, may move and live in a widely separated and perchance conflicting worlds."<sup>2</sup>

Burgess also noted: "One reason why cities always have been the centers of intellectual life is that they have not only made possible but have enforced an individualization. Only as every individual is permitted and compelled to focus his attention upon some small area of the common human experience, only as he learns to concentrate his efforts upon some small segment of the common task, can the best cooperation be maintained."<sup>3</sup>

Specialization includes a rational, purposive choice of friends and associates. The choice is not based on proximity of dwelling units but selectivity, with factors such as interest, work, children or a combination of these bringing them into mutual association. If we note a decline of interest in local neighborhood affairs

1 - MacIver, Society, op.cit., p.183.

2 - Burgess, Ernest W. The Growth of the City: An Introduction to a Research Project, p.19.

3 - Burgess, Ernest W. The Urban Community, p.5.

this should not be taken as evidence that the urban dweller lacks contacts and activities. Within contiguous communities people inevitably gravitate together into congenial groups. Riemer actually discouraged strong local participation when he said "cultural stagnation may well be expected when the individual is challenged to escape from participation in city wide and national problems into the parochial haven of neighborhood affairs."<sup>1</sup> We may seek for certain reasons to increase local neighborhood participation[, but this should be part of a simultaneous effort to also increase participation as a member of a very large group.

The urban dweller has substituted specialized group associations, based on rational free choice, for the unconscious integration into multibonded life of small communities. It may be argued that the urban dweller has not had completely free choice, and that he has not been free to participate in a multibonded life. However, it may also be argued that men form their institutions and that if a multibonded life were desired, opportunity has existed for it. Each city block is potentially bound by multibonded ties. The only valid argument, having established freedom of choice, is the virtue of unbonded life. It has been pointed out by Durkheim that a certain proportion of our population suffer what he describes as "anomic personality" or loss of identification and that this exists in larger measure in the city than in rural areas. It is not known whether this particular condition is a result of urban life or if it is identified in the city because

1 - Riemer, S. "The Neighborhood Concept in Theory and Application" Land Economics, February 1949, p. 71.

of the attraction to the city of the extremes in human personality. In any event, a clear distinction should be made between anomic<sup>?</sup> and anonymity. "Anonymity is a situation where individuals are free to carry on a private life. Anomic may accompany it but not necessarily so. The former is a desirable end to be sought." In an attempt to overcome the anomic we must be cautious not to also lose anonymity. This is the easier solution. Our effort in planning must be directed toward strengthening the feeling of belonging of all people, leaving them free to choose the group from which they derive this security.

### Conclusion

Planning for cities thus involves planning within the complex fibre of city life. Escape may be desired by a segment of our population but we must not focus our attention exclusively on this group. It must acknowledge the importance of mobility, time-orientation, specialization, and selectivity in organizing the various heterogeneous factors into group associations. The malignancy in certain manifestations and effects of certain of these characteristics must be controlled, while giving opportunity for the enriching aspects of these same characteristics. Planners will continue to devise physically safe neighborhoods.; these are not new ideas. But our orientation must accept as a basic premise social as well as physical considerations.

1 - Tannebaum, op.cit.,p.179.

## SIZE

The size of the physical environment to be developed for the satisfaction of certain social and physical needs of man has always been a concern of planners. The need for proximity to certain facilities and the tolerance of distance to others is realized. Here we will explore the social factors affecting the size which constitutes environment for different purposes and people.

The neighborhood size advocated by Perry was one of fifteen hundred to two thousand families, contained within an area one-half mile in diameter. There is no conclusive evidence regarding the appropriate and actual size of a neighborhood; there are physical and social neighborhoods, school neighborhoods and political neighborhoods, and the optimum sizes of each do not coincide necessarily. There are sufficiently divergent views to warrant a study of this problem in an effort to determine whether it is an absolute or under what conditions it varies, and to what extent.

Churchill<sup>1</sup> joined the group advocating small neighborhoods, suggesting thirty to sixty families, based on face to face contact. Augur felt that the neighborhood based on efficient size for the economical school sacrificed too many social virtues to efficiency and that the neighborhood should be below one thousand families.

1 - Churchill, Henry S. Neighborhood Design and Control: An Analysis of the Problems of Planned Subdivisions. National Committee on Housing, 1944.

It is obvious that the neighborhoods here referred to are personal acquaintance, primary, face to face neighborhoods. There is evidence to substantiate this small size for this purpose.

McKenzie<sup>1</sup> observed that the conception of neighborhood for an urban dweller is of a very small area within the immediate vicinity of his home, the limits of which seem to be determined by the extent of his personal observations and daily contact. He found considerable evidence to show that a street more than two blocks long tended to divide itself into sub-groups.

Sweetser's<sup>2</sup> study of neighboring in one block produced similar findings: employed persons tend to have small, spatially narrow acquaintance personal neighborhoods, selective in both age and sex, while their association neighborhood is less concentrated. Homemakers tend to become acquainted with neighbors without discrimination as to sex but their associates tend to be markedly concentrated among their very near neighbors. The small family's acquaintances are significantly more concentrated spatially and are more age selective than those of large families. Members of owner families tend to have larger acquaintance neighborhoods and to concentrate them less close to home than do renters. Neighborhoods increase in size and decrease in spatial concentration as length of residence increases. He concluded that acquaintance and associates are typically rather concentrated near homes. In a

1 - McKenzie, op.cit.

2 - Sweetser, Frank. Neighborhood Acquaintance and Association.

built-up area of separate houses a radius of two to four blocks would probably include the whole personal neighborhood. Neighborly relations are socially determinate in that they do involve a definite set of neighbors who participate mutually in them. They are really indeterminate in that they cannot be conceived as permeating uniformly any continuous boundable area.

Caplow<sup>1</sup> also noted a small neighborhood, observing that one block in his study of a student veterans project constituted an integrated community. The Group Dynamics<sup>2</sup> study of living units erected by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for student veterans revealed that in the one-family houses provided more than sixty percent of all sociometric choices were made in the chooser's court; in the multi-family structures the choices were made in the same building. Essentially then, these projects consisted of a series of somewhat distinct social units within a cohesive unit.

Roper's study<sup>3</sup> of Hyde Park's physical neighborhoods found evidence of a social neighborhood in two of these areas. Those who were acquainted and carried on those practices which we call neighboring were very small, congenial groups living in a single apartment house or in the dwellings stretched along one block.

In Merton's study<sup>4</sup> of Craftown there is evidence of the concentration of neighborhood with contact as the criteria for measuring neighborhood.

Among 600 people the following evidence was obtained?

- 1 - Caplow, T. and Forman, R. "Neighborhood Interaction in a Homogeneous Community".
- 2 - Festinger et al. Social Pressures in Informal Groups.
- 3 - Roper, op. cit.
- 4 - Merton, R.K. The Lamanaburg-Columbia Research on Human Relations: Human Relations in the Planned Community, An Interim Report.



Table 1

Location of Friends	
Same multiple dwelling	19 %
Adjacent building	22
Across the street	13
2-6 buildings removed	10
Elsewhere	36

We must realize, however, that although the social neighborhood tends to be a small, physical neighborhood, the small physical neighborhood is not always a social neighborhood. A study of Greenwich Village<sup>1</sup> disclosed that a group of the Villagers living in adjoining houses which had everything favorable to the development of a real neighborhood, created a cooperative enterprise to provide advantages for their children. Essentially the scheme was the utilization of the gardens of each house as one large, supervised play area for their children. But this group not only did not make good neighbors but were averse to neighboring as a form of social intercourse. They did not want to feel that the person next door had any social claim - they hoped to avoid easy intercourse. Their only interest in group living was the fact that it facilitated the solution of problems faced by families with children in an urban situation. By conscious effort they kept the group free from neighboring and back and forth visiting. It is not the author's purpose to advocate social neighbors and regret the lack of one here. It is only to point out that under all circumstances a social neighborhood will not arise, based on physical proximity, and to caution planners not to expect it. Planning can be effective without it. However, for that group who may want it, its achievement should be made possible by social planning.

1 - Ware, op. cit.

This evidence shows only the size of "neighboring" neighborhoods, in both planned and unplanned areas. They do not, however, furnish conclusive evidence that the major portion of a person's contacts are within this small area, but only that those contacts which are based on proximity are based on very close proximity. Beyond this selectivity occurs and covers a large area.

There are others who greatly expand the physical and social neighborhood. Riemer<sup>1</sup> feels that there is no reason to relate it to walking distance since space is no social barrier with effective means of transportation. Ogburn, also conscious of technological advance, holds that if a nearness that means contact is the essence of the neighborhood, then the neighborhood in the age of the telephone and the internal combustion engine may cover a large area.<sup>2</sup> Baken Brownell,<sup>3</sup> an advocate of small town living, relates the community to human measure as the criterion of size rather than the organizational structures necessary in its several functions. Since he feels human measure not to be fixed, but dependent upon the character and capacity of each group, he leaves the community a fluid size. Carpenter<sup>4</sup> also realized the essential boundlessness of social neighborhoods in observing that where neighborhood agencies succeeded in becoming a focal point for social organizations, their sphere of influence extended beyond the bounds of neighborhood.

1 - Riemer, S. "Hidden dimensions of neighborhood planning". Land Economics, May 1950, p. 197.

2 - Ogburn, W.F. Changing Patterns of Family Behavior and the Design of Non-Housing Facilities.

3 - Brownell, op. cit.

4 - Carpenter, op. cit., p.241.

McKenzie's study<sup>1</sup> furnishes information on the extent of social contacts within and without the neighborhood.

Table 2

	No.	%
Number of families reporting no visiting	235	23.5
Number of families reporting more visiting within neighborhood than without	506	50.6
Number of families reporting more visiting without neighborhood than within	222	22.2
Number of families reporting equal amount within and without neighborhood	15	1.5

These figures are interesting and stimulating. The large number of families who do no visiting at all are significant in size and also in their social implications. These are figures from one area but in it twenty-three percent of the total population had no social neighborhood. A large or small area would serve equally well for social purposes. For the group reporting more visiting within the neighborhood than without it it would be interesting to know whether this is based on proximity or is selective. Is neighborhood social contact non-selective with other social contact selective? What are the other characteristics of the group reporting more visiting without the neighborhood? Is this a function of income, family status, education or occupation differentiation?

McKenzie further found that the difficulty of maintaining local interest in local projects varied directly with the extent of the territory covered and the number of families included.

<sup>1</sup> - McKenzie, op.cit., p.602.

This study tends to confirm the theory of the two areas of social contact: the small area, having noted elsewhere that his study showed that within the neighborhood contacts occurred within two blocks, and the indeterminate "without the neighborhood".

The Middlesbrough study<sup>1</sup> tends to confirm this by showing the social contact of the residents as follows:

Table 3

	Housewives	Working Men	Working Women
Relatives	43	30	33
Neighbors	32	21	20
Workmates	8	40	40
Other	32	39	37

Although the area distribution of contact within the neighborhood is not given, it is clear that a large portion of all contacts are carried on outside the neighborhood. The neighborhoods in this study were both planned and unplanned. Since a larger number of social contacts of all groups fall into the "other" category, a breakdown of this would be helpful. Social contacts are seemingly selective and people do not base the major portion of them on proximity. This will vary with degree of isolation and degree of mobility, however.

A study was made in Bloomington, Indiana<sup>2</sup> to determine whether areas of acquaintance, recognition, residence and the functioning of organizations exist in a coextensive neighborhood. The acquaintance patterns of families was studied. The basis used in

checking neighborhood cohesiveness was the use of two stores and

1 - Glass, Ruth. Social Background of a Plan: Study of Middlesbrough.

2 - Owen, Mary. Study of Pigeon Hill in Bloomington, Indiana.

a church in the area. All families studied were of American stock, low income, with only two Negroes in the area. The study showed that the stores close by were used much by the residents. The Church, however, had a membership of fifty percent from outside the area. It seemingly was a function in which selectivity was exercised, with proximity not determining use.

The hypothesis was that, whereas in a village community situation the term neighborhood included a spatial configuration of the areas of residence, organization, functioning, acquaintance, and recognition of objects or places, this is no longer true, and although the four phenomena occur, there is little necessary spatial coextension of them. Evidence supported this and conclusions were drawn that (1) no measure of one of the areas of acquaintance, recognition, residence or the functioning of organizations is adequate for the description of neighborhood (2) these four areas are not coextensive in at least semi-urban sections. The argument may be advanced with some validity that because of the relatively high amount of primary group activity, segregation and homogeneity within this area, a more typical urban section would show even less coexistence of areas.

This does not indicate that there are no planning neighborhoods (location of police, fire, shopping and other such facilities in strategic, convenient and safe locations) but does bear on the inclusive neighborhood of social contacts, activities, organizations, with which this paper deals.

In a study of Watling the above hypotheses were substantiated. It was found that self-contained neighborhoods did not exist. The boundaries of neighborhood life varied for different activities and different age groups. School areas differed markedly from those of adult clubs, even where the school and adult club were next to each other.<sup>1</sup>

Selectivity seems a factor of major importance in the social neighborhood, which does not appear to conform to the physical "planning" neighborhood. The physical does not appear to control the social, since they result from different considerations. In turn, it does not seem indicated to attempt to adjust the physical to the social unless community facilities for group activity for the neighborhood are involved. Social needs cannot serve as a justification for physical planning as now conceived. If they are to become part of physical planning they must shape the physical neighborhood, not be fitted into it.

In addition to social contact, a neighborhood implies use of certain facilities. It will be well to attempt to determine the area over which this usage occurs, and to ascertain the variables.

#### Metropolitan Neighborhood

Foley<sup>2</sup>, in 1947, studied the facility use by 401 residents of a middle class district about four miles from the center of St. Louis. This district was well served by facilities. The writer's hypothesis was that metropolitan residents make relatively little use of local facilities. They study revealed that forty-seven percent of

1 - Durant, op. cit.

2 - Foley, Donald. "The Use of Local Facilities in a Metropolis".

the reported facility uses were within onemile of the user's home, twenty percent were between one and three miles and thirty-three percent were three miles away. The median distance away was 2.4 miles. The transportation used was: walking - thirty-six percent; public transit - thirty-one percent and automobile - thirty percent. The summertime participation in outdoor activities was completely nonlocal except for the children's use of playground facilities. Practically one hundred percent of the responses showed such activities as major league baseball games, municipal operas, visits to zoos, outdoor swimming, golf, hunting fishing, picnics and outings which were all out of the district. Attendance at union meetings and at business and professional meetings was about ninety percent out of the district, although there are no figures to indicate how extensive participation in these was. Young adults, aged eighteen to thirty-four, made the least use of facilities. Young persons and those over sixty-five made the most extensive use of local facilities. The facilities used were not identified, however. The less the user's formal education, the more use he made of local facilities. This does not, however, indicate what the facilities used were. We do not know whether their use of facilities was primarily shopping and service, or whether they also engaged heavily in organizations but confined their location to the district. He concluded that with adequate transportation urban residents will and do go far out of their local districts to make use of many types of facilities. It is apparent that most residents accept the longer trip as a counterpart of the specialization that is so intrinsically a part of metropolitan growth. A more detailed breakdown follows:

Table 4

Location of Facility-Use Reports			
	Within District	Adjacent	Away from
Food Shopping	69.3	26.5	4.2
Church	77.1	5.2	17.7
School	68.2	9.0	22.8
Movie	58.4	15.6	26.0
Indoor activities (club)	35.5	9.7	54.8
Doctors	29.7	8.5	61.8
Clothing and furniture	5.1	19.7	75.2
Employment	17.5	5.3	77.2
Sports, etc.	10.1	0.4	89.5

It is apparent that a "planning neighborhood" of any size can exist, but that the determining factor, if so, will be physical, not social. Many activities, both service and social, will not take place within the area. Since the physical neighborhood is concerned with distance to facilities, types of facilities, this type of evidence is valuable in indicating that size for these purposes varies with various groups. Normative planning tends to oversimplify such evidence. Planners may base location of these facilities on pedestrian access. However, it seems undesirable to establish this requirement when in many cases there will be no real need. In certain instances planning could be freed of this restriction.

Muncy sought to determine what a neighborhood is and what its functions are.<sup>1</sup> She surveyed a Cambridge physical neighborhood to determine distance from facilities and degree of satisfaction with this distance among different income groups.

Relative to distance from school she found that sixty-eight percent

1 - Muncy, Dorothy. What Is a Neighborhood?



of the homes were within four blocks, twelve percent from five to seven. The lowest rent group lived closest to the school - seventy-eight percent within four blocks. Of the highest rent group, forty-two percent were within four blocks, while fifty percent were eleven blocks or more away. The degree of satisfaction seemed to coincide with distance from school by all except the highest rent group. In the highest rent group only thirty percent wishes the school nearer, whereas fifty percent lived eleven blocks or more from the school. The trend seemed to be an increasing dissatisfaction with distance among those who lived up to seven blocks from the school. It was broken at twelve blocks or more, where forty-six percent indicated satisfaction with the distance.

Branch's study<sup>1</sup> of this same subject found that fifteen percent of urban residents are dissatisfied with an elementary school more than one-half mile away; forty-three percent object to a distance over one mile. Eight percent consider a high school more than a half mile away too distant and thirty-six percent disapprove when it is more than a mile.

Muncy's study also covered shopping facilities. Dissatisfaction seemed to coincide with a distance of over seven blocks in all income groups except the highest. Eighty-one percent of the entire group lived within seven blocks of the shopping center. The lower rent groups lived closer to shopping center than did the higher rent

1 - Branch, Melville. Urban Planning and Public Opinion.

groups. In the lowest income group only fourteen percent lived eight or more blocks away, while thirty-one percent of the highest rent group lived this distance. Seventy-eight percent of the people were satisfied in the distance they travel to shopping. Dissatisfaction seemed to coincide with a distance of over seven blocks in all income groups except the highest. Thirty percent of this group travelled eight blocks or more, with only twenty-two percent indicating they would like a shopping center nearer home.

The lowest rent group wanted to live closest to their church. In the highest rent group fifty-two percent lived eight blocks or more away, while only nineteen percent wished to live nearer than that. Seventy-three percent of those surveyed lived within easy walking distance. By rent groups eighty-three percent of the lowest rent group and forty-eight percent of the highest rent group were within walking distance. Seventy-four percent were satisfied with the distance between home and church. Seventy-four percent of the Catholics lived within four blocks; ninety percent of the Jews lived eleven or more blocks away. Sixty-nine percent of the Catholics living eleven or more blocks away wished to live closer while only forty-four percent of the Protestants living this distance expressed the same wish.

### Conclusions

We must conclude, therefore, that we cannot proceed from a pre-

determined size but must realize that the size of neighborhood varies with the function of the neighborhood, and that all facility neighborhoods are not coextensive. Personal selectivity influences this. Income influences the degree of selectivity which can be exercised. It is necessary to determine the radius of various functions; if they coincide for several functions it may be advantageous to integrate an area, but even the size of the integrated area is unknown. It seems highly likely also that the size will vary with the density of population. Perhaps we should accept Henry Cohen's classification of relationships as an aid in our planning, attempting to determine the locational pattern of these relationships. He classified areas as (a) geographically oriented relationships (b) interest-oriented relationships (contractural, occupational, functional; church, school, etc.) and (c) primary relationships on a basic emotional level, including both family ties in the home and close relatives or personal friends elsewhere. We may find each of these categories localized or we may find them dispersed. If we find them localized it is highly possible that they are not all localized in the same area. Thus our planning cannot be based on location of facilities for all such relationships in the same area. In certain instances evidence will dictate location of such facilities in the same area. Sometimes does not mean always. Perhaps more facilities will be desired than we are thinking of. In certain instances fewer will be needed or desired. Since facilities serve people, the needs and desires of people must be the determinant. These needs and desires vary under

various conditions for various groups.

It is apparent that empirical evidence of the present location of these functions is not sufficient and that we must seek further, searching for the reason for this geographical pattern. Under what conditions, and at what scale, should the planner try to design a "neighborhood" as a separate, identifiable unit which would actually contain within its limits most of the social activities of the people? And under what circumstances would it be more important to plan no physical boundaries at all, or better transit facilities to the metropolitan center.

Insofar as physical planning is planning for people as is social planning, it is not optimum planning unless it bases its physical planning on an understanding of people. We may decide that certain facilities should be within a certain distance of all people. But why should we? On what evidence is this based? It cannot be on physical considerations since such location is dependent on people. It is apparent that certain facilities are not influenced by factors of selectivity and can be treated as fixed element. These would include such facilities as water, fire protection, police protection; these may be planned on a purely physical basis, since they constitute only a physical environment. Other facilities, also physical, constitute man's social environment and must be planned with the wisdom arising from knowledge and understanding of social man. This, coupled with a knowledge of physical man, his capacity

for walking, his need for sun and air, should allow us to plan the most desirable total environment. They will be different environments, since just as physical conditions vary from area to area, resulting in different physical expressions of basic needs, so social conditions vary with area as well as status. The varying social conditions will find different expressions.

## MOBILITY

We have noted the increased mobility of people it is well also to understand the effects of this phenomenon and the greater freedom which it has given to man. It has served to alter one way of life but has it also created a different, but equally full existence?

Insofar as mobility is characterized by movement, the following description of Hawley's is appropriate:

"Change without movement is impossible. In organic life changeability is the measure of adaptive capacity, and mobility is the mechanism of change. Starting life with a minimum of activity, the individual gradually expands his sphere of movement. Forms of life may be scaled and rated on the basis of capacity for movement. Plants and animals differ fundamentally in this respect. The stationary plants must achieve an adaptation to an environment delineated by the reach of its roots and leaves. The mobile animal lives in a wider world. This power of locomotion enables him to exploit a larger food area and also to adjust more quickly and selectively to environmental change. The quality of life most useful in nature, from the point of view of the domination of a wider environment, is the quality of changeableness, plasticity, mobility, or versatility."<sup>1</sup>

These observed qualities of mobility in nature are also appropriate in describing man's adaptation to man's world.

Mobility and the moving about of people has resulted in an interchange of stimulation, ideas and social contact. It has created a condition favorable to change. Today we live in a dynamic economic and social order, which cannot exist without a flexible, adaptive population. Insofar as mobility has produced

conditions fostering the change-adaptive character of our country

<sup>1</sup> - Hawley, op.cit., p.324.

it is an integral part of this new social order. The communities of the nineteenth century inclined toward change-resistance, just as we know that today the small town by and large represents conservatism, adhering to traditional ideas and concepts. This is accentuated with distance from a metropolitan center.

As noted, man's behavior tends to become very rigid because of static social and economic conditions. In our stable, small communities there was a strong disinclination to move. Prior to the Industrial Revolution neighborhoods or areas were usually economically self-sufficient and neighboring was important. The families in a neighborhood possessed many traits in common which constituted a cumulative social group of a high order of cohesion. Nearly always they had known each other a lifetime. Socio-cultural differentiation was slight.

Man possesses desires for recognition or status, for safety or security, for power, and for new experience, the satisfaction of which has been found through change. The Twentieth Century, with its rapid tempo, its advance in communication and transportation, has made us acutely aware of this intensified fluidity, enlarging the possibility of change or facilitating movement. In our context it is probably little different than its manifestations were to earlier man in his context. History reveals to us endless examples of mobility, indicating it to be an ever present occurrence, rather

than a new phenomenon. This increased tempo of mobility has allowed man to seek more individualistic pursuits, affording him the greater selectivity. This marks a change from the small group in which he once found his pleasure and functioned.

These advances have been a causative factor in the rise of our large urban centers. They contribute largely to the freedom and resultant individualism which man enjoys. Man is free to move and to participate at will. He seeks the social environment which he finds most congenial, and the employment which gives him the greatest benefit. His horizon of choice is greatly enlarged. In an immobile society man functioned less as an individual and more as a member of a small group.

Change itself has promoted change, since with initial changes have come increased stimulations which tend to produce further change.

#### Types of Mobility

There are, however, various manifestations of mobility. Long-range mobility covers great distances, involving change of job, change of total environment. Short-range mobility involves movement within a particular area for such reasons as desire for better housing or changed family status. Vertical mobility results in a change of social environment but does not necessarily involve physical movement, although this frequently accompanies it. The fourth type of mobility is mobility of interest, wherein the area of social or interest satisfaction is greatly enlarged, and one person during the course of a day can participate in various activities in widely separated places, returning in the evening to his home.



## Mobility of Population, 1949 to 1950

Residence 1949	U.S. Total	%	Urban	%	Rural Non-Farm	%	Rural Farm	%
Persons 1 yr. and over	147,545,000		94,092,000	63.9	30,387,000	20.6	23,066,000	15.5
Same house as 1949	119,677,000	81.1	76,073,000	80.8	23,852,000	78.5	19,751,000	85.6
Different house same county	16,356,000	11.1	10,764,000	11.4	3,617,000	11.9	1,975,000	8.6
Different county or abroad	9,175,000	6.2	5,632,000	6.0	2,438,000	8.0	1,104,000	4.8
Residence not reported	2,337,000	1.6	1,623,000	1.7	479,000	1.6	236,000	1.0

We see that in a one year period among the urban population which is our chief concern, we have eighty percent remaining in the same house, eleven percent changing houses, and six percent engaging in long-range mobility between counties. Certain of the rural mobility will also be reflected in the cities since a certain amount of it involves a move to an urban center. Rural non-farm mobility is higher than that of any other group; presumably this will include some peripheral city development.

As has been seen, long-range mobility affects a large portion of our population and is increasing. This type of mobility, however, occurs infrequently and may be followed by long periods of stability in an area. Not only the advances in transportation have facilitated this type of mobility but also the progressive transfer of manual skills to machinery has given rise to a large number of semi-skilled workers who are among the most mobile of our population. They can quickly adjust to new jobs employing new machines. The increased communication of ideas and knowledge of other places played its part in the stimulation of long-range mobility.

Arising from the desire for status, recognition, or power we recognize social, or vertical, mobility. We know from past studies that twenty percent of the population moves up in social class during each generation.<sup>1</sup> Here we encounter a basic tenet of democracy - the equality of opportunity. The effect of this seems to negate the long-term stability of a neighborhood unless the neighborhood is preceded by a classless society (refer to chapter dealing with homogeneity) for these people will desire the changed amenities and symbols of their new status. They will not remain frozen in the same homes.

Sorokin's study of social mobility revealed the pattern which it takes.<sup>2</sup> The closer the affinity between occupations the more

intensive among them is mutual interchange of members, and the

1 - Sorokin, P. Social Mobility, p.383

2 - Sorokin, P. ibid., p.439

greater the difference between occupations, the less the number of individuals shifting from one group to another. If we divide occupations into (1) qualified professional and big business, (2) less qualified professionals and small business (3) semi-professional and clerical, (4) skilled (5) semi-skilled (6) unskilled, he found greater stability among the middle occupational strata than among the two extremes.

Short-range mobility, within an area, results not only from vertical mobility but from change in age and composition of families. Not only is it that the same house does not always fulfill all the needs of a family cycle but even the location of interests may vary so that the location of desirable housing changes.

Glick's study of the Family Cycle<sup>1</sup> showed that in 1940, from the preceding five year period:

Table 4

Family heads under 35 years in same house or apt.	16 %
Family heads over 55 years in same house or apt.	64
Family heads under 35 years moved	84
Family heads over 55 years moved	30

The implication of these statistics is an obvious indication that among the younger group ties are less strong; the older families also undergo change (children marry, distances too great, etc.) which results in some moving.

The last type of mobility, inter-area mobility of persons in pursuit of satisfaction of psychological needs, interests, is

1 - *ibid.*, p.164

dealt with more extensively in the sections of this paper on primary group and on participation. Here we shall only refer to the fact that opportunity for broadened interests has freed man from the necessary dependence of his immediate environment. A time rather than place orientation has developed, and distance is thus measured in time. Insofar as all things are relative, and man is a creature who is moulded by his environment, adapting to it, there is no absolute in desirable time and distance. Man has more leisure time than ever before and an increased ability to traverse distance. These two factors have markedly affected his social pattern. The slower modes of transportation and communication enforced a close knit community neighborhood, born more of necessity than desire. Society now exists in and through communication. By means of it individuals share in common experiences and maintain a common life. Under these circumstances the concept of distance and of mobility have come to have a new significance. Mobility is important as a sociological concept only insofar as it insures new social contact, and physical distance is significant for social relations only when it is possible to interpret it in terms of social distance.

It has been observed repeatedly that space is experienced within the frame work of a time system. Space has been described as a time-cost variable. The distance that may be travelled for any purpose, assuming a given amount of time at the disposal of a

traveller, is contingent on the speed and efficiency of existing transport facilities. Hence the territorial scope of the community and, to a large extent, the number of individuals who may live in close mutual dependence are fixed by the time required for the overcoming of distance.

Similarly, the distribution of units within the community varies with the time used in movement. A temporal pattern is implicit in each and every spatial pattern. As a result of this the organizations of spatially separate populations have merged at many points giving rise to very extensive and inclusive communities.

The term community, interpreted to connote a compact, easily distinguishable entity, has lost much of its meaning. Examination of the spatial aspect of interdependence discloses that a community may have not one boundary, be it a line or a zone, but two or more. It is possible to observe a series of concentric zones about a center, indicating frequency of movement to and from the center. The extent to which contacts with the center are direct, involving the movement of individuals, or indirect involving a circulation of ideas and products rather than people. The intensity of local community life appears to diminish with decreased distance from the center, though it may not be entirely vitiated even at minimum distances.

But mobility is considered also a demoralizing force. "The mobility of city life, with its increase in the number and intensity of

stimulation, tends inevitably to confuse and demoralize the person, for an essential element in the mores and in personal morality is consistency of the type that is natural in the social control of the primary group. Where mobility is greatest, and where, in consequence, primary controls break down, there develop areas of demoralization."<sup>1</sup>

Let us examine the effects of mobility and consider first the sociological reasons, i.e. that mobility lessens the social control of the primary group, and that the increase in stimulation of urban life tends to confuse and demoralize people. Mobility has afforded the opportunity for certain segments of the small town's population to change environment and in this way has lessened the hold of this instrument of social control. For those who do not desire the opportunity, the small town environment still exists. However, is it possible that substitute and contemporary instruments of social control have developed in the urban areas? Let us not mistake a previous form of social control for the essence of social control; such control can be exercised by groups other than the neighborhood.

Some disorganization has resulted from the rapid growth of cities but these effects should be less pronounced now as cities approach their maturity. Cities which show gradual growth have evidenced much less disorganization. Is the control of mobility the only way to lessen the effects of disorganization? Is mobility the causative

1 - Perry, Housing for the Machine Age, p.218.

causative factor or are there other more important factors creating disorganization? Data is lacking on this important point and it should be intensively studied to ascertain cause and effect. Without these studies we cannot yet conclude that controlling mobility will decrease disorganization, but we may say that it may add to stability.

We should also examine the justification of the neighborhood, sufficiently strong to withstand outside forces, as an instrument in providing a stability which is essential in maintaining good homes, thus upholding property values.<sup>1</sup>

It is not possible to understand how, for the maintenance of high physical standards, mobility must be controlled, and this by means of self-contained neighborhood units. High physical standards can be maintained by taxes, by enforcement of existing restrictions, by planning. Mobility seems more deep-rooted than to lend itself to control by living in a self-contained neighborhood. However, one type of mobility, ie short-range mobility in search of better living facilities, will be restrained by the neighborhood. It would, however, be equally restrained by the provision of good housing, not in a neighborhood unit, so the key here is good planning and good housing, not neighborhoodings.

Since the other types of mobility would remain, ie. vertical, long-distance, that resulting from changed family needs, opportunities and desires, it is well to examine the effect of mobility

1 - Perry, Housing for the Machine Age, p.79

on the neighborhood. Muncy in Cambridge found that although the trend showed an increase in the number of neighbors visited as the length of residence increased, it was not consistent. Even when the residence in the neighborhood was over ten years, well above the majority of persons visited less than four families. The survey showed that the average number of families visited was between two and three.<sup>1</sup>

This evidence is not from a planned neighborhood and may result from few facilities furthering neighborhood social life. The area may have had people of too widely differing backgrounds and may have been directed toward urban life.

The actual effect of mobility on social contacts was studied by Caplow.<sup>2</sup> He found that where the neighborhood and the interest group coincide, there will be a high degree of association, regardless of whether the milieu is urban or rural, stable or mobile. He further was able to substantiate the hypothesis that more symbiosis is unlikely to lead to intimacy in the residential neighborhood by finding in a study of a student veterans project that an increase in neighboring score with length of residence was entirely attributable to an increase in the number of acquaintances made; intensity of relationship did not increase with length of residence.

Stability, however, did not occur for more than a four year period

1 - Muncy, op. cit.

2 - Caplow, op. cit., p.366.



because of the nature of the inhabitants. An increase in total number of residents known does give evidence of increased neighborhood participation. This was, however, a small area involving face to face contact of all residents, who are homogeneous.

In Greenwich Village Ware found that shorter residence on a block worked against the block's functioning as an integrated neighborhood unit. Where people moved to a new block there appeared to be a tendency for former associations to persist rather than for new connections to be made.<sup>1</sup>

### Conclusion

We can thus conclude that a certain degree of mobility will continue and that planning should be directed toward facilitation of mobility for those for whom it is important. Already the standardization of facilities in various areas throughout the country has tended to make a new place less strange and to ease the adjustment, thus undertaking a partial attack on the problem of anomic individuals. Research is under way to improve mobile housing. Since institutions are less mobile than people, it would be well to place these at strategic, easily reached points so that they can continue to serve the same population even if the population has engaged in short-range mobility. For that segment of the population who are less mobile because of income or family status, neighborhood planning may be desirable.

- - - - -  
1 - Ware, op.cit.

Neighborhood planning, however, may be the planning of small areas. There is no conclusive evidence that the large neighborhood is necessary for the primary social contact of people in residential areas. Social disorganization may be relieved by well-planned small areas and well-planned large areas.

We can conclude that man will continue a certain pattern of mobility which may well increase as the ease of mobility increases. Mobility in itself is not an ill. A changed social pattern does result from a life which includes mobility but the resulting pattern can be as satisfying as that which exists without mobility.

## POPULATION COMPOSITION

Population compositions are frequently referred to as homogeneous or heterogeneous. It is obvious that this does not refer to only one characteristic but to the several that man possesses. These many categories and classifications must be studied as they tend to affect the social pattern.

Clarence Perry's proposal for a neighborhood unit stated his belief that with a homogeneous population it was possible to engender a true neighborhood spirit.<sup>1</sup> Subsequent advocates of this theory have recommended a heterogeneous social base, without changing or adjusting the remainder of the concept. One may be sympathetic with the righteousness of the intent, but facts must guide our thoughts toward a realization of that idealism. The terms "heterogeneous" and "mixed" implying "democratic" are being loosely and freely used in describing the neighborhoods which planners should be seeking. To clarify this thinking we shall attempt to isolate the components of this heterogeneous social structure, to understand differences in people which lead to their grouping being called "mixed", hence desirable, and to understand the basis of stratification.

Max Weber conceived of class in the somewhat Marxian sense of an economic interest group. "Property and lack of property are the basic categories of all class situations."<sup>2</sup> He distinguished

1 - Perry, Regional Survey, p.55.

2 - Weber, M. Essays in Sociology, p.186.

# POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

## Married Couples 1950

Total Popl.	% of Total	Married + Couples	% of Total	Rural Non- Farm Married	% of Total	Rural Farm Married	% of Total	Urban Married	% of Total
152,000,000		70,640,000	46	14,076,000	9.2	10,658,000	6.8	45,916,000	30
+ In population figures									

## Single Persons - 1949 - 14 years and over

Total Popl. 14 years and over	Total Single Popl. 14 years and over	% of Total	Total Single Male	% of Total	Total Single Female	% of Total
109,449,000+ Excludes service personnel	25,126,000	23	13,952,000	12.8	11,174,000	10.2

To gain further understanding of the population with which we are concerned we find a total of 47,706,000 children under 18 years of age, according to the census figures of March, 1950. The 1948 census showed a total of 8,197,000 individuals not living in families, of which group 5,879,000 were classified as urban residents.

between social status and social stratification, with social stratum a plurality of individuals, who, within a larger group, enjoyed a particular kind of honor and virtue because of this position. Distinct social strata are based on a peculiar style of life including particularly the type of occupation pursued, heredity, etc. "Social status groups are a normal community...above all else a specific style of life can be expected from all those who wish to belong to the circle."

### Economic Status

G. Schmoller<sup>1</sup> concluded that size of income was the basis of class differentiation in Germany. He noted that a similar richness or poverty made people solidary with each other and antagonistic toward other groups. This economic stratification was noted by Plato who referred to the division of a state or society into two states - the rich and the poor, which always conspired against each other. Schaffer noted the unity of the rich by virtue of common interest growing out of the possession of property. The dispossessed were held together by the struggle for a living wage and by their common hatred of propertied class. Others<sup>2</sup> also noted the importance of wealth, holding that because of the influence of poverty and riches upon human life, membership in a group characterized by one of these became one of the coordinates of defining one's position in the socio-cultural universe.

+ + - - -

2 - Sorokin, P. Society, Culture and Personality.

At the present time wealth holds a peculiar position as a symbol of prestige. Getting ahead is measured in terms of financial gain, and the prestigious representations of our society represent this goal concept. The importance of money is not only in that it measures the ability to pay rent but also in that it is an index of other family characteristics. MacIver holds that it is doubtful whether social classes and racial differences would be effective in segregation if these forces were not so intimately correlated with economic status.<sup>1</sup> We have, however, seen that when economic status is controlled, other bases for stratification arise (for example the USSR which now represents a highly stratified society, though disavowing wealth as the base).

### Occupational Stratification

Occupational stratification is important. From the standpoint of attractiveness, prestige, remuneration, power, domination and subordination, the unskilled manual occupations have usually occupied the lowest position, followed by the semi-skilled. The occupations that require a high degree of intelligence, are highly important for the population, and that consist of intellectual or creative work have regularly been the superior occupations. Inequality seems the inevitable accomplishment of functional differentiation. Opportunity should be given to all to utilize to the fullest whatever qualities they may have, but

1 - MacIver, Society, op.cit, p.88.

education cannot close this gap that exists, although it may serve to bring the extremes closer together. Because of this inequality based on inherent characteristics it seems unlikely to eliminate the present situation of some men being fitted for menial tasks and some for responsible positions.

### Intergroup Stratification

Intergroup stratification also occurs. In Middletown<sup>1</sup> there were several lawyers of superior and inferior status, with the members of the same stratum treating each other as equals and those of different strata discriminating as between superiors and inferiors.

### Selectivity

MacIver recognized the differences in men when he wrote:

"We all inhabit a single world, but the world is somehow different for every species, nay for every living thing within it. Thousands of species of organic creatures live side by side, yet each has an environment not wholly that of any other."<sup>2</sup>

He considers man's selectivity in social situations as purposive.

Thus social selection increases in intensity as society grows.

To him class is a group held together by a complex of interests; opposition of groups within a community is more continuous, and embittered the greater the complex of interests which unites its members and separates the group from others. We can distinguish economic, social, political, intellectual, power, prestige interests.

1 - Lynd, H. and Lynd, R. Middletown.

2 - MacIver, Community, op.cit., p.76.

Cantril observed this selectivity and commented on its desirability:

"Man's sense of active participation is greatest when the environment through which participation is possible includes other human beings with purposes and capacities similar to his own. If an individual, like a bodily cell, is to function at all properly, and to grow and develop, he must be integrated into a larger functional unit. We have already seen that we can have effective group action only to the extent that people have similar assumptive form worlds that serve as springboards for similar action."<sup>1</sup>

Developing this similarity of "assumptive form worlds" many sociologists have written on group action within various social structures.

Social groups in the community are rarely insulated from contact with one another. Impersonal interaction does occur. However, ethnocentrism and consciousness of kind manifests itself in terms of intimate association. King, in his Brandford study,<sup>2</sup> reported that Catholic and Protestant may trade at the same grocery stores, but they are much less likely to live together as man and wife. Machinists and plant executives may work under the same roof but chances of their living in the same neighborhood are few; Yankee and Italian may send their children off to the same school every morning, but they seldom sit around the same bridge table. The Branford study provided evidence to support a hypothesis that social cleavage

<sup>1</sup> - Steiner, J.F. The American Community in Action.

<sup>1</sup> - Cantril, op.cit., p.136

<sup>2</sup> - King, C.W. Social Cleavage in a New England Community, p.322.



between groups in a community is generally greater when these groups are characterized by social differences which are ascribed than when they are characterized by differences which are achieved.

Steiner<sup>1</sup>, in his study of communities, concluded that the heterogeneous elements that have become a part of the community make unity of action difficult, and thereby prevent the social, political, educational and religious institutions from keeping pace with industrial growth. Urban environment is distinguished from rural life by the greater degree of heterogeneity existing. Might it not be that, in the rural setting in which the neighborhood functioned effectively, random neighboring was possible because of the homogeneity of income, nationality, racial and religious composition?

Others have shown that similarities in taste, ideas and beliefs, manners and morals unmistakably facilitate the relationship of liking, sympathy and solidarity among the individuals and groups while the dissimilarities in this field tend to increase the relationship of repulsion or antipathy.<sup>3</sup>

It has been found that neighborhood agencies and settlement houses built up their constituents from special interest groups and not from the communities at large.<sup>2</sup> Only very powerful inhibiting factors can prevent intensive and intimate interaction among per-

1 - Steiner, J.F. The American Community in Action.

2 - Carpenter, op.cit., p.242.

3 - Giddings, F.H. Civilization and Society

sons of similar status whenever opportunity affords.<sup>1</sup> The more heterogeneous a neighborhood in the social characteristics of its residents, the more likely it is that friendship formation will depend most on organized associations, less on informal contacts and very little on sheer proximity.<sup>2</sup> Thus, in heterogeneous geographical areas of any size the association pattern becomes selective, a characteristic of the city, destroying the solidary association pattern of the cohesive neighborhood group.

There is a tendency for neighborhood spirit to decline as a neighborhood changes from homogeneous to heterogeneous; the practice of neighboring and participation in local activities also decline. Interests, which had been localized, become scattered over the city.<sup>3</sup> It appears that the integration of the neighborhood requires a certain homogeneity of the population.<sup>4</sup> If this is found to be true, we must choose between conflicting ends, realizing that the achieving of one may be at the cost of sacrificing another, for the cohesive and heterogeneous neighborhood do not seem compatible or related goals, if size and other factors are controlled.

In a study of Watling, a housing estate in England, this factor of the need for homogeneity for social integration of the area was noted when it was stated that there cannot be a common mode of living where there is considerable social differentiation as

1 - Caplow, op.cit., p.366.

2 - Festinger, op.cit.

3 - McClenahan, B.A. The Changing Urban Neighborhood from Neighbor to Nigh Dweller.

4 - Queen, op.cit.

measured by origin, size, income, occupation or ages of the families.<sup>1</sup>

In the Greenwich Village study, previously referred to, there are references to the schools and their efforts to get the parents of the children together. These efforts were obstructed by the fact that they represented different groups which were "hard to mix". In this same study difference in religion, between Catholic and Protestant, was found to be an added source of social distance. An even more profound gulf existed between the religious and the irreligious, as for some it was a major social institution. "So in each of the social groups living in the community, individuals were faced by fragments of conflicting culture patterns and conflicting principles of social organization. Under these conditions they were forced to make their social adjustments in terms of themselves as isolated individuals rather than as parts of coherent social wholes. The result was a great weakening of social contacts and an almost complete absence of community integration."<sup>2</sup>

We can accept this prima facie evidence but not as absolute and we must question why this occurred. Is it possible that a major reason was the type of heterogeneity which existed, not heterogeneity itself? The groups in the Village represented extreme groups on the social scale. This evidence may be true for the

- - - - -  
1 - Durant, op.cit.

2 - Ware, op.cit.

particular groups represented but not true of all heterogeneous groups. Was mobility of population a contributing cause? Was the centralized urban location another factor? We can only seek for further interpretation of evidence presented, treating it as a guide to continued study and search for the reason for the failure of some groups to successfully live together. Or should we perhaps at times dispense with the criteria of group cohesion as a measure of successful living?

Whatever else, the complexity and heterogeneity of most groups does become apparent. It is necessary to isolate out the governing characteristics in each group and to understand their functions. A population homogeneous in some characteristics may be heterogeneous in many others.

Considerable concentration of social activities existed in only five of the twenty-six neighborhoods studied in the town of Middlesbrough.<sup>1</sup> The remainder were merely distinct territorial groups without the additional attributes of social integration. Mid-Linthrope, the most prosperous neighborhood, had the lowest rank for integration. Of the five most neighborly groups, four were geographically isolated, the fifth being geographically clearly distinct. All were poor. Moreover, they were also all socially homogeneous. In the groups with complete dispersal of their social activities there were hardly any characteristics in

---

1 - Glass, op.cit.

common with each other. From this it was concluded that "it does not appear as though the presence of any particular characteristics creates dispersal, but as though dispersal is the very norm. As poverty implied social homogeneity and is often allied with geographical isolation, it is possible that poverty contributes most to social integration. Along this line, this same study showed that of twelve neighborhoods verging on social integration only two were prosperous."

But again we only question, what were the other factors? What is it that poverty characterized that created neighborhoods?

Madge, the British sociologist, reported that the principal reason for leaving a housing estate was dislike to the estate as such, and particularly the dislike of neighbors. The population was said to be "too mixed."<sup>1</sup> He has stated that, in his opinion, it is unrealistic to attempt to house widely different income classes in the same street or group of houses. An estate of 20,000 should cater, according to him, for a wide variety of incomes, all of whom would share certain amenities and not others. The Ministry of Town and Country Planning has realized this and has recommended that houses should be developed in groups of one hundred and upwards for particular class strata. This, presumably, implies economic and occupation strata, but we have seen that even with this in common, other factors may be sufficiently important to limit the group life which is likely to arise. The problem is far more complex than this.

1. Jeroms, R. and Madge, J. Housing Estates, p.68
2. *ibid.*, p.90.

In Watling, cleavages basically existed between large and small families and between those with secure and insecure incomes, so in the area of homogeneous absolute income, other forces come into play. Perhaps they are less apparent when income is not constant; this may be the primary cause of cleavage but it may also disguise the secondary factors.

Branch's study, a portion of which dealt with neighborhoods, found that sixty-nine percent of the people preferred their kind of neighborhood for the following reasons:<sup>1</sup>

Table 5

Friends, friendly or neighborly	46 %
Tend to own business	21
My kind - same standards, interests and financial status	11
American - native born	7
Other	15

The twenty-four percent who would prefer another kind of neighborhood gave the following reasons:

Table 6

Low or uneducated class, desire better class	25 %
Color - or special racial or religious characteristics	11
Foreigners	11
Not friendly	11
Don't mind own business	6
Other	36

This is considered a representative, national cross-sample.

It is natural to question what percentage of the respondents lived in mixed neighborhoods in order to determine what portion of that group preferred another kind of neighborhood because of this. Without this information we cannot say whether ten percent of those in mixed neighborhoods preferred to live or whether one

1 - Branch, op.cit.

one hundred percent of the group desired to leave. Only cumulatively does such information become a part of a larger body of knowledge, pointing a direction.

### Race

Four hundred and fifty people rated social distance from certain groups in the following categories: (1) admit to close kinship by marriage (2) have as chums (3) have as neighbors (4) admit as members of one's occupation (5) admit as citizens (6) admit as visitors only to country (7) exclude. Armenians, Negroes, Chinese, Turks were admitted by only a few to the first three relationships and by a substantial number into categories (6) and (7). English, French, other Northern European groups were admitted freely to the first five categories and placed in (6) and (7) scarcely by anyone.<sup>1</sup>

This should furnish at least a background for our further consideration of racially heterogeneous living groups, although it is not conclusive evidence. One wonders how much the respondents were registering reaction to race and how much race was a symbol, in which they were actually responding to difference in economic, educational and occupational level. One questions the degree of contact the respondents had had with these groups and whether strangeness had not engendered antagonism. Whatever, the cause, there is evidence of stratification based on something which must be found.

1 - Bogardus, E.S. "Social Distance in the City" in Burgess, E.W., Urban Community, p.52.

Where ethnic or racial hostility exists it tends to be most marked in those spheres or contact which imply intimacy of access and equality of status. It seems that it is there that prejudice is most intense and the barriers to inter-ethnic association highest.<sup>1</sup> The potential of inter-ethnic association is highest, seemingly reaching a peak in the housing community which at once involves symbolic equality of status and inevitability of social contact.

It is, therefore, necessary to examine the recommendation for heterogeneous populations with special reference to the racial issue. And since we assume that a heterogeneous neighborhood is not an end in itself, but a means, we shall attempt to determine the end which is sought, the means best able to achieve that end, and the actual experience in interracial housing in attaining that end, drawing on all evidence available.

"What are the effects of living in a socially homogeneous area? Has anyone studied the attitude of such people toward racial questions vs. views of those from mixed neighborhoods? How important is environment in forming our opinions about democracy?"<sup>1</sup>

We assume that the end is the elimination of racial feeling and the integration of all races on equal terms. We might be guided by MacIver's observations that economics is perhaps the basic segregating force, or religion as others point out, or occupation.

- - - -  
1 - Merton, op.cit.



But we must determine here, as in other cases, the causes and effects. Might it not be that when education and income reach a certain level that the Negro stereotype will vanish? When this is accomplished heterogeneity of race may cease to be important barrier to harmonious relations. At that time other secondary factors may become the stratifying ones, which are now disguised by the primary racial question in some areas in the same way that income disguises in other areas.

However, until such time as these inequalities do not exist, the matter of interracial housing must be carefully considered. Widely divergent economic and social levels, coupled with interracial housing, may serve to increase social distance and tension.

There is no evidence that non-segregated schools, which constitute the greater percentage of our schools, have resulted in greater social contact between the families representing various racial backgrounds. Since we recognize that non-segregated schools function with little friction, it seems that it has been a means to increased respect and lessened discrimination but not to increased social contact.

Negroes and whites have lived in the same area in the South but with other factors so important that frequency of contact has not resulted in a lessening of racial feeling. Our recommendation of interracial housing may have to consider the differences in different areas.

Deutsch and Collins studied interracial housing and observed

"The difficulty of recruiting and retaining the white group when it feels itself to be in the minority must be realistically appraised. It was observed that a neighborhood typically tends to become more Negro than white. The implication is that it is unrealistic to expect either white persons to move into a Negro neighborhood or white families to remain in a neighborhood which is predominantly Negro."<sup>1</sup>

This statement should be considered cautiously since there is no substantiating data and apparently represents only an impression.

Merton reported similar findings in his study of a biracial housing development, with the population divided equally between Negro and white. Among those white residents hostile to Negroes there existed marked anxieties concerning the future proportion of the community.<sup>2</sup> This will, it seems, be particularly important where the planning unit constitutes an area separate from the larger community. It is possible that this is more important where the proportion is evaluated in terms of the housing project than if it were a more integral part of a larger unit of differing proportion.

In the Deutsch and Collins study all of the informants stated that one must be wary of the concept that the provision of facilities, especially recreational facilities, is a panacea for hostile inter-group relations.<sup>3</sup> If further studies result in the same conclusion, arrived at in a more systematic manner, including data on the facilities

1 - Deutsch, M. and Collins, M.E. Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment, p.8.

2 - Merton, Labanburg Study, op.cit.

3 - Deutsch, op.cit., p.8.

used together, if any, the background of the informants, previous attitude toward race, etc. we may then plan a more purposeful intermixture of population without increasing tension. It is this further program that may be the key to the lessening of racial feeling. So the question becomes what further program the planner has for the alleviation of these feelings than a simple mixture of population with joint community facilities. It is this further program which may be the key to the lessening of racial feeling with interracial housing perhaps complementary. The importance of this contribution must be determined, and under what conditions it is important.

A segregated racial pattern with young unmarried adults was observed in the projects studied by Deutsch and Collins, even where there was fraternization among children and married adults. Many mothers of young children, happily living in the projects, expressed concern for the future of their children as adolescents. They felt that they would, at that time, have to move to a segregated area. Thus, in this case, racial heterogeneity seems possible with mobility, which is antithetical to the development of a tradition in an area, a true community. Again, we must choose between conflicting goals, for certain goals are impossible of achievement if others are gained.

Two interracial projects were studied by this group, ie Koaltown with forty Negro families per one hundred families, living in a segregated portion of the project, and Sackville with seventy Negro families per one hundred families. This group was not segregated. The population in Koaltown was predominantly Jewish.

The following table reveals the attitudes of different groups within these projects to the Negro. With differences in background we can see evidence of the difference in attitude toward race. It is interesting that these differences are not economic, since this was fairly constant; this indicates that in these areas opinions resulted from many differences, and that economic differentiation alone is not responsible for racial feeling. Thus, we must question whether the elimination of economic inequality will be able to overcome other differences.

Table 6

Percentage of Housewives in Different Classifications Who Have No Neighborly Relations with Negro People.		
	Koaltown +	Sackville
Political Attitude		
Liberal	60 %	36 %
Middle of the Road	59	22
Conservative	61	26
Education		
Public School	68	39
Some High School	50	30
High School and Some College	53	16
Religion		
Protestant	25	31
Catholic	58	35
Jewish	67	13

+ Language was a barrier since the Jewish population spoke Yiddish predominantly.

It would be interesting to have comparative figures on the attitude of housewives of various education levels toward Negroes of the same or different education level. A study of the attitude of working men by occupation toward Negro men, by occupation, would be important. Whereas we differentiate the white group by various factors we do not make any distinction in the Negro group. Attitudes toward "Negroes" abstractly may be different than attitudes toward Negroes on various levels, representing less the group and more individual characteristics.

The differences in Koaltown and Sackville are not surprising since we have seen that neighboring occurs in a small area and the two groups were different in physical pattern, ie Koaltown had Negro families geographically segregated. Hence neighboring did not extend far geographically. These differences in number of friendly relations may measure distance more than racial attitude. Because of this we cannot conclude that living in a segregated area or non-segregated project was responsible for the differences; the differences could have resulted only from physical distance. This is at least a possible explanation and should be considered.

The following table indicates the percentage of housewives with different feelings toward Negro people living in the project:

Table 7	Koaltown	Sackville
Like Negroes and want to be friendly	42 %	60 %
Mixed or reserved feelings	30	12
Avoidant feelings	28	28

The higher percentage of persons with friendly feelings in the non-segregated project could have been due to (a) language barrier in Koaltown (b) physical distance leading to fewer contacts in Koaltown (c) greater contact has bred greater good will. It has also, apparently, not affected bad will, since both projects showed the same percentage with avoidant feelings. Perhaps this represents a prejudiced group.

It should be borne in mind that living in this, as in most projects, represented lack of freedom of choice of housing due to the shortage or inability to finance such a move. Project living usually anticipates some mobility, since such conditions are considered temporary. The latter point raises some doubt as to whether, given free choice and the idea of stability, the percentage indicating a desire for friendly relations would desire a mixed neighborhood. The following table bears on this, indicating the feelings of families in the projects toward a continuation of inter-racial housing:

Table 8

Percentage of Housewives Recommending a City Policy of Assigning Negro and White Families to Any Place in Any Project or to Separate Buildings or Separate Projects

	Koaltown	Sackville
To any place in project	53 %	53 %
Separate building	9	7
Separate project	38	40

It is interesting that both the segregated and unsegregated projects show the same percentage recommending a separate project for Negroes. It is further interesting that sixty percent of the same group in Sackville had indicated a desire for friendly relations with Negroes, and yet only fifty-three percent recommended mixed, unsegregated projects. It is difficult to reconcile this. Perhaps, in spite of friendliness they succumb to other outside influences, quite apart from their own feelings. At best it is therefore indicated that the percentage would probably not be higher in home ownership areas. It is clear that if the cause for this is outside influence we cannot attach inter-racial housing out of context. It cannot be separated from outside influences and we must face problems as they exist in our society of today in which outside influence is part of the total environment.

There was evidence in both projects of less respect and friendliness directed toward Negroes generally than toward Negroes in the project. The residents showed a higher percentage of these feelings evident in Sackville than in Koaltown, indicating some transfer of good will:

Table 8

Percentage of Housewives Indicating Respect for and  
Friendliness toward Negroes

	Koaltown	Sackville
Respect for		
Negroes in Project	51%	63%
Negroes in General	27	46
Friendliness toward		
Negroes in Project	30	50
Negroes in General	19	37

A higher percentage of those in the non-segregated project expressed respect and friendliness for Negroes in general than did residents of Koaltown, although in both cases it was a lower figure than for Negroes in the project. It is possible that friendships have developed based on common interests which does not affect attitude toward a whole group of unspecified, unidentified persons. This is possibly what we seek - a situation where Negroes cease to represent so much a race as they do individuals with particular interests, personalities and characteristics. The differences in Koaltown and Sackville probably stem again from physical distance with its resulting social pattern.

The following gives an indication of the attitude of these people who have lived in an inter-racial project toward Negroes in various relationships with themselves.



Table 9

Percentage of Housewives Responding Negatively to the Idea of Having Negroes in Various Relationships to Them+

	Koaltown	Sackville
As Mayor of the City	18 %	19 %
Tenants in Same Building	25	22
Schoolmates of Their Children	33	31
Fellow Members in a Social Club	43	26
Fellow Workers	22	24

+It should be noted that those who were not negative also were ~~ant~~ positive but were neutral.

It is again interesting that the responses of the residents of Koaltown and Sackville so closely parallel each other, except in the attitude toward Negroes as fellow members in a social club. It is very probable that the residents of Sackville had had this relationship with Negroes and it was therefore less strange to them. We cannot detect any very major effect of interracial living on attitude toward these relationships with this exception. The high percentage indicating reluctance toward mixed schools, greater reluctance than toward tenancy in the same building is surprising and inexplicable. Perhaps there was something unique in their school. Perhaps parents felt that they were able to exercise greater control in their own homes than was possible in the school.

### Ethnic

Merton's work in Crafttown is suggestive of the type of feeling engendered in mixed ethnic groups. There were no Negroes in this town. All but eight percent of the population were American born,

fifty percent were Catholic, forty-three percent Protestant and four percent Jewish. More than one-half reported greater contact with other ethnic groups than they previously had and only ten percent reported fewer such contacts. Those indicating that they had had increased contact were asked their reaction to it. On the basis of responses they were classified as Liberals - those who liked the increased contact - thirty-seven percent; Illiberals - those who did not like it - ten percent; and Indifferent - those who were indifferent - fifty-three percent. Because of this it is interesting to note that the Liberals were the most likely to be politically active, about one-quarter of them holding office as compared to ten percent of the remainder. Thus the Liberals were in a strategic position to make their influence felt.<sup>1</sup>

Merton's conclusion from this study is that sheer frequency of contact does not make for improved ethnic relations, but rather that it requires contact under conditions in which one is compelled to work with others toward a common objective.

Even this study does not explore all possibilities, since it concerns attitudes toward an undisclosed composition of races. The antagonism toward certain European ethnic groups has not been of the severity as that toward Asiatic or Negro groups, and the study would be of greater significance if it identified attitudes toward Japanese, Mexicans, etc. separately. With only eight percent of the population non-American born, the problem is not significant, Merton, Lavahaburg Study, op.cit.

and the large number of indifferent responses can possibly be attributed to this. This seems the only logical explanation to the fact that this category was larger than the other two combined. Also important is the fact that the range of income was held constant. A comparative study of reactions at increasing proportions of foreign born would be interesting, and a study of reactions within a community of varied income, particularly if the non-American born represented a lower income.

There is further information on differing attitudes and friendship patterns in heterogeneous vs. homogeneous areas within the community. Homogeneous or heterogeneous referred to the ethnic composition, but the size and population of these areas is not given. There was a slight tendency for people living in a heterogeneous neighborhood to have fewer friends than those in a homogeneous environment as indicated below:

Table 9

Number of Friends	Homogeneous	Intermediate	Heterogeneous
None	36	34	38
1	13	20	21
2	21	18	12
3	31	29	26

We do not know what other factors contributed to this nor do we know whether this referred to friends in the area only.

More people held liberal attitudes toward ethnic relations in homogeneous neighborhoods than in heterogeneous areas, which is surprising, but there was likewise a higher number of illiberals in the homogeneous area. The greatest number of indifferent res-

ponses came from the heterogeneous area, which indicates that the effect of the area probably had less effect than the initial inclination of the people.

Table 10

## Attitude - Ethnic Relations

	Homogeneous	Intermediate	Heterogeneous
Liberal	38 %	44	33
Indifferent	47	48	58
Illiberal	16	8	9

Religion

King, in a study of Branford, a New England town,<sup>1</sup> found evidence of the effect of religion on social cleavage. Seventy-four percent of all families he studied lived in areas in which their own religious faith predominated. By contrast, only half the families were located in districts populated principally by their own ethnic group, and only forty-five percent resided where persons in similar occupations were numerically dominant. In the case of economic status the percentage of concentration dropped to thirty-five. In organizations there it was found that one half of all memberships were found in cliques made up entirely of Protestants or Catholics and only thirty-nine percent were limited to associations containing only one ethnic group. Cliques in which economic status was the basis for homogeneity comprise only fourteen percent of the total number of memberships and in terms of occupational homogeneity, the population was only eight percent. These results are sufficiently startling and contrary to other evidence to make

1 - King, op.cit., p.325.

it seem that they are specific for this area. Certainly before a generalization would be possible, substantiating evidence would be needed from other areas.

In Crafttown, for instance, religious affiliation did not seem to shape the selection of friends in the community:

Table 10

Friends	Informants	
	Protestants	Catholics
Protestant	53	40
Catholic	42	51
Other	5	9

### Occupation

A very important study was made of social stratification in Greenbelt, Maryland, a planned community, which bears close examination.<sup>1</sup> The Federal Security Agency, in line with its general policy, sought to create conditions which would operate against the formation of classes and class antagonism, and the means of achieving this are interesting. All residents were selected so as to be of a similar economic status, and local economic and social life was operated cooperatively. There were no old families creating social barriers against newcomers. Families were of the lower middle class. It was planned that status or economic segregation could not occur on the basis of ecology. All the residents were white and only two and a half percent were foreign born. Sixty-one percent had a high school education or

- - - -

1 - Form, W.H. "Status Stratification in a Planned Community".



Room 14-0551  
77 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
Ph: 617.253.2800  
Email: [docs@mit.edu](mailto:docs@mit.edu)  
<http://libraries.mit.edu/docs>

## **DISCLAIMER**

**Page has been omitted due to a pagination error  
by the author.**

pg. 98

better, and fifteen percent were at the other extreme of no high school training. The median age was thirty-five. Eighty percent of the workers were employed by the Federal Government, sixty-five percent in clerical positions. Twenty-four percent were Catholic, seven percent Jewish and sixty-five percent Protestant.

When the town was opened for occupancy there was much social and organizational activity. Shortly, certain types of stratification began to appear, which can be described as follows: the officials were at the top of the power pyramid. They were a political, economic and educational elite and were a tightly woven ingroup. They were much sought but participated little. Just below them was the professional group which was highly esteemed, but not identified psychologically with the above group. They maintained a self-satisfied social and organizational independence. When they indicated interest in a group they were immediately sought to head it, irrespective of their competence.

Status group three was composed of members of the town council, head managers of the cooperative, editor of the local weekly, board of directors of the cooperatives and presidents of the large groups, such as the American Legion. They had some official contact with the groups above.

The wives of the upper three status groups were bound by intimate

contact. Their club was the only organization in which one became a member only by invitation.

The fourth group was composed of the petty officials, heads of committees. Below them was the largest group, the clerical workers who were affiliated with one or two organizations. Indifference described them. Down the hierarchy were the manual workers, below the clerical workers. Since the average income of the groups was similar, one may infer that the status differences were largely occupational. Here is the confirmation of Sorokin's theory of class stratification by occupation, following the same categories.

At the very bottom of this stratification were the town's maintenance laborers. They had no psychological relations with other manual laborers in the town. A curt salutation constituted the total contact of this stratum with the others.

There was some racial feeling directed toward those of Hebraic faith. They participated more actively than the general population at the beginning; prejudice was latent but as competition for election of officers became more acute, the Jews were accused of sticking together and monopolizing offices.

This study, however, seems to contain an inherent contradiction; purportedly a homogeneous economic group, the lack of wage differentiation between the groups mentioned seems questionable. If, however, this was true, it points to the fact that no economic



factors alone define a group as homogeneous, and we must turn also to other variables in an effort to determine homogeneity or heterogeneity. It is, however, interesting to see that neighborliness did occur that that it resulted less from proximity than from selectivity. In spite of selectivity of friends it appears that there was a corporate life, engaged in not so much by individuals but by individuals as members of a group. This again may have resulted from its isolation.

### Conclusion

It is impossible to formulate definite recommendations for the grouping of men. Certain underlying principles are, however, obvious. Man exercises selectivity for social contacts, and, depending on factors of income and mobility, is more or less dependent on immediately adjacent contacts. For certain groups the facilitation of mobility lessens the importance of the social composition of the immediate environment. The resulting heterogeneity of such areas, however, may result in reduced strength of neighborhood or area ties. For other groups for whom the home environment constitutes the major social environment, the social composition of neighbors will be important. For this group certain heterogeneous characteristics are tolerable and will not lessen the cohesiveness of the group, but these characteristics should not represent too wide a spread in the range of values or characteristics. Nothing in this statement should be construed to recommend large

homogeneous areas for such a social environment which is needed is small in area. There are distinct disadvantages and limitations in large homogeneous areas, the most discernible being a form of segregation which generates a multitude of ills.

## PARTICIPATION

Man's social life involves participation in certain group activities; it includes recreation, interest-oriented activities, civic groups, and solitary activities. This paper is concerned with this participation since it represents another important area of man's social life.

Before we can plan for active organizations in our neighborhoods we must understand the organization participation pattern of people, and the importance of organizations to them. Since the neighborhood unit is potentially the focus of recreational, interest and political activity it becomes necessary to examine these categories separately.

### Organizations

Komarovsky studied the voluntary associations of urban dwellers with high significant findings.<sup>1</sup> She noted that sixty percent of the working class men and fifty-three percent of white collar men have no single organized group affiliation with the exception of the church. Participation was positively correlated with education in all but the Jewish group, who were highly organized, although often lacking education. This was possibly due to the fact that superior education and home background created interests which found outlets in cultural and hobby clubs. Many associations had a middle class membership which discouraged the lower classes just as it attracted the middle class as a symbol of status.

1 - Komarovsky, M. "The Voluntary Associations of Urban Dwellers", p.691.

104

The male, unskilled worker, of which thirty-two percent belonged to associations, joined a social and athletic club and later in life a fraternal lodge. Seventy-six percent of the membership of the skilled workers was divided between union and fraternal lodge. Forty-three percent of the total affiliations of business men with an income between \$3000 and \$5000 were in fraternal or masonic organizations. Catholics had a consistently lower rate of participation in civic and cultural associations than did people of other religions. In the younger group the married of both sexes participated less than the single.

For purposes of neighborhood planning it is most significant that the young married group participated less than the young single; if families with children constitute the bulk of the population of a neighborhood, far less organization activity should be expected than from a single group, unless a marked change from the present pattern occurs. The ability of a neighborhood to support lodges, fraternal and union organizations must be considered since in this study they seem to constitute the bulk of associations. In view of this study we must first question whether all people want organization activity. We must not necessarily use it as a criteria of neighborhood cohesiveness and activity since other manifestations may be more indicative.

Bushee studied social organizations in Boulder, Colorado,<sup>1</sup> with a population of 11,985. He found a total of 268 organizations with

1 - Bushee, F.A. "Social Organizations in a Small City". American Journal of Sociology, November 1945, p.217.

a total membership of 17,326. These memberships represented 8,542 individuals. Thus seventy-one percent of the population belonged to an average of two groups each, while twenty-nine percent, or 3500 people belonged to none. It should be borne in mind that this was a University town which may explain the relatively high degree of participation. The memberships are broken down as follows:

## Organizations and Membership

Type of Organization	No.	Adult Membership	% Male	% Female	Attendance
Church	23	5372	38.1	61.9)	)----- 58 %
Other religious	46	2339	24.5	75.5)	
Fraternal	21	2298	55	45	35
Educational	41	2005	14.6	85.4	52
Social	41	1350	13.4	86.6	59
Economic	21	1337	80.6	19.4	47
Recreational	36	890	57.4	42.6	72
Social Service	16	779	31.5	68.5	58
Patriotic	9	572	41.2	58.8	51
Cultural	14	382	20.7	79.3	68.6
Total	268	17,324	37.6	62.4	

His findings confirm those of Komarovsky in that he found that of 278 persons belonging to six or more organizations, 3.3 percent of the total in organizations, 118, or forty-two percent, occupied the best grade houses. Inasmuch as dwellings of this grade constituted only seventeen percent of the total, a preponderance of persons active in six or more organizations occupied them.

Only eight percent of persons belonging to six or more organizations lived in inferior dwellings. Of 354 adults occupying houses below standards of desirability, 232 or sixty-five percent joined no organization, as compared with twenty-nine percent of the total population. Of the thirty-five percent which belonged to some organization, almost half belonged to a church only, leaving sixty-six or eighteen percent belonging to some group other than the church.

Again we must use valid criteria in evaluating the adjustment of the population. It is possible that the lower income group feel neither the desire nor necessity to be active. But this is important for planning for it is clear that different groups lead widely different lives. They apparently do not mingle in organized activities, since these tend to be homogeneous and one-group dominated.

In Greenbelt, Maryland neighborhood organizations were encouraged; thirty percent of the families were affiliated with no organization, seventy percent were affiliated with at least one. This correlates with Bushee's findings. Forty-five percent belonged to two or more

groups. Affiliation and income were slightly and positively related. Age and affiliation were also positively related. The thirty percent non-membership may be attributable to a type of social stratification (already described) but if so, it calls for a closer study of the individual components of neighborhoods or communities before predictions are made regarding their success, assuming, of course, that organizational membership is a valid index of something other than itself, and is desirable.

From these studies it is obvious that the lowest economic group and the lower educational group participated least. This is particularly true where there is a predominance of the upper educational level, creating organizations in which participation of the lower level becomes impossible. If it is ascertained that organization membership is desirable for this group we must plan accordingly. The presence of classes above themselves may result in a reluctance to belong. The existence of social pressure and symbols of prestige may increase their feeling of inferiority. Homogeneity in organizations may be important, and it may be desirable to establish certain groups designed for this level, foregoing the mingling of heterogeneous elements. Again, we must choose between conflicting goals. If one purpose of planning is to increase the opportunity for participation of all people, we must not adopt other measures which will serve to decrease the possibility of achieving this goal. If we seek a number of different ends we must realize that the achieving of one



may result in the sacrificing of the other. We must be aware of these differences and at least attempt to reconcile them, or re-orient our efforts, clarifying the major goal, subordinating others.

Past efforts to reach this lower economic group have not been too successful, even in homogeneous areas: In a survey of the use of community buildings in low-rent housing projects where efforts were made toward group activities, the following data was gathered:<sup>1</sup>

Number	%	Activity
43	16	No programs
86	32	One or two programs

Those projects which reported two activities, reported that one was a Boy or Girl Scout group. We do not know, however, if these programs were wisely chosen.

All of this may be evidence that the lower income and lower education group does not desire organized group activity.

Perhaps groups further the interests of the middle and upper groups but offer little to the lower. It is most regrettable that these studies considered only income as a variable. We should hope for studies giving a breakdown by such categories as race and occupation. Perhaps it isn't income at all which is the determinant but occupations, since these two are closely correlated.

White lived as a social organizer in a housing estate of 5000 persons in England, built to rehouse a slum population. He re-

1 - Egan, Taylor. Article in Journal of Housing, April 1950.

corded life there and the inability to engender any neighborhood spirit. The response of the tenants to the organizing of a community association for them was nil. Various other efforts to develop community activities, including the publication of a newspaper, thrived only so long as someone from outside the estate managed them. In contrast to the experience of some slum areas, the bombings neither engendered a sense of neighborliness nor evoked any degree of cooperation.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps these efforts are misdirected since we are not certain that there are positive values in "belonging" not to be found elsewhere but advocates of the neighborhood theory point to the fact that it aims at promoting the conscious participation of residents in community activities.<sup>1</sup> The evidence so far at least points out that the lower income group may engage in neighboring in the area immediately adjacent to them, but that the larger neighborhood impact will be little felt and that they will participate little, thus limiting the cohesiveness of the group.

Evidence from Watling follows the same trend. Only a small group of people functioned actively in community center affairs. During 1936 a total of 809, or less than five percent of the people belonged, and only 230 for more than nine months; of a total population of 5000 families. The majority of the members lived within three hundred yards of the center. There were two evening institutes offering courses to adults. In 1936 the total number of students

1 - White. L.E. Tenement Town, p.24.

was 329 from the Estate and 190 from other places.<sup>1</sup> The population here, as in White's study, was economically homogeneous but we need to know what their interests were, occupations and education before we can definitely determine what group is served by organizations.

In a North Carolina housing project it was found, among white women, that during the time of their housing in substandard units, forty-seven of the seventy-two women with children belonged to the PTA. This pattern continued after they lived in a well-planned project, and, strangely, participation in the PTA declined. Among Negro women, while in the slums, twenty-nine percent belonged to one or more organizations other than the PTA. This rose to thirty-two percent in the project with seventy percent belonging to the PTA. White men had no organization participation in the slums and only three percent in the project; Negro men showed twenty percent participation in the slums and twenty-five percent in the project.<sup>2</sup>

Merton's work showed that with people not accustomed to group participation, a pattern of little participation continued in spite of living in well organized neighborhoods with many community facilities.<sup>3</sup>

As Kenneth Kidd said "While acknowledging the need and desirability

- - - -

1 - Durant, op.cit.

2 - Winston, S. Social Aspects of Public Housing.

3 - Merton, Lavanaburg Study, op.cit.



Room 14-0551  
77 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
Ph: 617.253.2800  
Email: [docs@mit.edu](mailto:docs@mit.edu)  
<http://libraries.mit.edu/docs>

## **DISCLAIMER**

**Page has been omitted due to a pagination error  
by the author.**

pg. 112

for a community center or other medium whereby families of low-rent housing projects can get together to give expression to common interest, one should recognize at the same time that the mere presence of such a center, even with an active program, does not assure a community of common interests."<sup>1</sup> The Middlesbrough study served to confirm this by showing that the adequacy of institutional equipment appeared a less decisive factor in neighborhood activity than might be assumed.

All of this seems to indicate less emphasis on the "community-centeredness" of neighborhoods; commercial entertainment or informal home activities may be the principal leisure time activities. There seems little justification for basing a neighborhood on the size necessary to support various types of organizations, nor does it seem likely that we should consider adult activities in planning our schools. Such needs are dependent on the composition of the population; in view of insufficient controlled studies we at present have evidence only that organizations play a more important role in the life of the upper and middle income group. This may be due to other hidden reasons but until further work is done we can identify the group only in this way. Before we plan for organizations within an area for this group, however, we must study the degree of selectivity which they exercise, which may again mean that close-at-hand facilities are not used. This bears directly on an aspect of Perry's concept of neighborhood in which the ele-

1 - Kidd, K. Four Million Tenants: A Study of English Public Housing Management.

mentary school would serve as the focus and community center for group activities. We cannot assume that they will occur, and thus we must consider school planning on a less tenuous base. Since it will not in all cases serve as this, it is not necessary in all cases to plan and place it for this. This would free us to plan smaller schools, dispersed throughout the area, where maximum child safety could be achieved - or it could free us to remove the school entirely from the neighborhood where that seem indicated. Perry's observations and recommendations on group participation may have been a proper deduction from his observations of Forest Hills but may vary widely when such a careful selection of residents is not possible.

The Ware study of Greenwich Village revealed the pattern of participation in a heterogeneous urban neighborhood. Greenwich Village constituted a neighborhood - with obvious boundaries, a school within walking distance, shops, community house, and a heterogeneous population, composed of Irish, Italians and a newer immigrant group, the middle income intellectual. Association and participation patterns in this area are noteworthy. Among 198 of the new residents responding to a questionnaire as to which neighborhood facilities they used, less than half patronized anything except food stores, restaurants and movies. Only eighty-three percent patronized local food stores, for which one might expect one hundred percent patronage, indicating the non-dependence of the group on neighborhood resources. One person used the nei gh-

Use of Neighborhood Facilities by  
New Residents

s - 198 respondents

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Number Using</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Community House	1	
Local Clinic	5	2.5
Local School	6	3
Church	24	12
Public Library	64	32
Food Store	164	83

borhood or community house, five a local clinic, six or three percent the local school, twelve percent the church and thirty-two percent the public library. This same group indicated their activities as below: Of a sample of three hundred, ninety-six people or thirty-two percent belonged to a club of a recreational nature, four percent belonged to a professional or civic club, and sixty-four percent belonged to no organizations at all. Of the leisure time activities of these people, we find that reading was the first choice listed as recreation by fifty-three percent of the people, and occupied a great portion of the time of ninety-three percent. Thirteen percent were occupied chiefly in creative or contemplative work.

The recreational centers sponsored intellectual programs such as discussions, lectures and classes. With the exception of dramatics, these recurrent efforts consistently met with poor response. Only the small group which had had some college training but with insufficient money to join a professional or other club, supported intellectual or semi-intellectual activities. Most of those who had not gone to college were not interested and those who had gone felt too superior to attend.

Commercial entertainment, particularly the movies, took the place of organized recreation offered by recreation centers or indulged in by spontaneously organized groups. Among those, who, for economic or other reasons, could not afford commercial entertainment



"hanging around" candy stores, ice cream parlors or cigar stores became the chief form of entertainment. The groups which hung around together were all more or less exclusive affairs and the places which became their hangouts tended to be inaccessible to others.

Between 1920 and 1930, with a total population between the ages of ten and twenty in 1920 of 4845 persons, and 3186 persons in 1930, three or four hundred persons were active members of recreation centers.

Boys clubs, serving the entire population, were active but with limited success. "The boys who patronized recreational centers were of a more or less distinctive type, known from the point of view of the centers themselves as better boys and to the toughs on the street as the "sissy type". Although one institution made a special effort to reach the delinquent type, and others professed a similar desire, actually the boys with more clearly defined interests and more refined standards of behavior were to be found at the recreational centers, while the rougher type remained outside. There was some variation between centers - a somewhat rougher element being attracted to boxing, for instance, in one center, as against those who were content with basketball at another.

With recreation centers constantly seeking to enlarge their membership, and with their program attractive to only a limited

group, all the agencies found their turnover large. Each reported a small, constant nucleus of select individuals who constituted the group which more or less possessed the center, while a large floating element came and went. In some instances the possessive attitude of the small nucleus kept others out. Boys in street groups stated as their reason for not going to the nearest recreational center "The crowd there acts as though it owned the place." Centers drew less from their immediate environment and more from distant areas.

In spite of the fact that each house stressed character development and leadership, each reported failure in developing these characteristics. The boys showed little responsibility to the house, being primarily concerned with what they could get out of it.

### Conclusion

The implication of this study for planning is that many facilities are needed. No one community center for a population of from five to ten thousand will serve a large portion of the population. Among this so-called "homogeneous" group, differences were sufficiently great to necessitate many facilities as outlets for the people. It seems that if we seek community-centeredness we must attempt to reconcile the ideas with facts. Perhaps planning many community-type facilities, which will necessarily serve larger areas but will satisfy the interests and desires of people, is called for. Clearly

neighborhoods will be of different sizes and will overlap. So our definition of neighborhood becomes involved for are they "overlapping" neighborhoods or are they neighborhoods at all? Perhaps the neighborhood is a small, homogeneous grouping. Perhaps it is the area in which one enjoys many facilities and where many interests are located. But this may be sufficiently fluid to result in our talking of an area - call it neighborhood if desired, but an area of many varied functions and facilities.

The Village presents a study of a heterogeneous area which actually evolved into two homogeneous areas, existing side by side but with very little contact. The differences were more than income, although they may have arisen from income differentiation, producing differentiation in manner of living, recreation, interests, morals, values. Even within these "homogeneous" areas wide differences existed in the people. It is probable that the degree of differences between the two groups of residents was too great - they were too spread on the scale of education, occupation and income to be able to reach over to each other. Greater interaction would probably have occurred if the differences had represented only a one or two step interval on our scale.

Homogeneous Neighborhood

A study was made in Radburn of six hundred and eighty-six persons (three hundred and thirty-six families), seventy-seven percent of whom owned their own homes, with a median age of thirty-five, about eighty percent of whom had some college training<sup>1</sup>

1 - Hudson, R.B., Radburn: A Plan of Living.

The following data may be of help in determining the percentage of the population in various types of activities. In evaluating this it should be borne in mind that the study was made during the depression years when free entertainment was a necessity. Given higher incomes it is impossible to predict what the participation level would have been.

Table 11

The total participation of men and women

	Recreational	Educational	Citizenship	Religious
Men	55 %	25 %	15 %	5 %
Women	30	46	13	10

Examining the three most popular types of activities in terms of the absolute degree of men and women participating in them we find:

Table 12

	Recreational (2.6 entries per person)	Educational (2.49 entries per person)	Citizenship (0.88 entries per person)
% of total men responsible for	61	31	49
% of total women responsible for	39	68	51

Sex differences are thus apparent. These figures correspond rather closely with those Bushee found for "recreational" and "citizenship" participation. Participation in "educational" activities is higher, which may be substantiation of the theory that greater distance from the city increases the likelihood of success, since Radburn was located at a distance of about twenty miles from New York. Let us not, however, overlook such factors

as high income, education, etc. since this may well be a function of one of these. Differences in participation relative to amount of education did occur as shown in the following table:

Table 13

Percentage of Participation

	In one activity	In 3 or more	In education only	Education, Recreation, Citizenship
College trained	100	90	72	50
High School trained	96	90	48	20
Unknown education	93	70	48	27

In interpreting these figures it must be remembered that eighty percent of the residents belonged to the first group, college trained. It is possible that the remaining felt this group to dominate, but it is interesting that this is a significant consideration since occupation and income were similar. It would be desirable to have figures also broken down by home-owner - apartment dweller, and by family status. There are still no studies to show the effect of children on drawing parents together although we often refer to it, and can infer a certain amount of information from other studies, not specifically directed to this. We do find, however, that this relatively homogeneous group participated in many joint activities, and that a small number was able to support an active program. A large area was not needed and the small homogeneous group became a community. Differences occurred in the area of heterogeneity, ie education. We cannot apply these findings to other homogeneous groups, and

ascribe the success to the homogeneity. It is applicable only to a similar group in a similar location. It is quite possible that the homogeneity was not the primary reason for the success, which may possibly be due to other characteristics of the group. Perhaps it is the higher income and education group which manifests this type of group cohesiveness; a lower economic group might be equally successful without any of these characteristics.

### Recreation

The National Recreation Association<sup>1</sup> investigated the leisure time of five thousand people, having a carefully selected sample arrived at by distributing questionnaires to public libraries, churches, industrial plants, insurance companies, department stores, relief organizations.

The results obtained indicate that the home plays a very important part in people's leisure time. The range of greatest unmet needs and desires was in the types of activity which individuals were unable to provide for themselves and which must be provided by public or private agencies. Games, sports and outing activities headed the desired list. Physical activity was greatly desired. Social activity and organized group activities were conspicuously absent; activities which trained people for jobs, or which have a direct economic value were absent. No adult education activities were represented. Single persons of both sexes took part in more outside than home activities; married men took part about equally

1 - National Recreation Association. The Leisure Time of Five Thousand People, p.22.

in both, whereas married women engaged in more home than outside activities. In games and sports participation was sustained to a much greater degree by married men than single men. Relatively few married women took part in games and sports - active interest in sports of both single and married women dropped earlier than it did in men. Home activities had an increasingly important place in life as persons became older.

Single men desired more activities than any other group and married women had a greater desire for home than outside activities. At ages twenty-seven to thirty-five they desired activities more than at any other time; these activities included music, drama, social and commercial recreational activities, flower gardening. Activities greatly desired by men and women were swimming, tennis, boating, auto riding, gardening, golf, camping, playing musical instrument, attending theater.

The Radburn study also showed swimming and tennis to be the activities most indulged in, although there were facilities for many other kinds, including baseball, volleyball, bowling, basketball, and gymnasium activities. Bridge, clearly a home activity, was the activity most enjoyed.

These results are highly suggestive for the planner, indicating a need for physical equipment for tennis and swimming, and a lack of desire for group and social activities, decreasing the need for a community center. The results pertaining to the higher proportion

of activities among single than married people confirm those of Kamarovsky. The importance of the home is clearly emphasized and it seems likely that with good homes we may expect the concentration of a large part of leisure time activities there, rather than a transferral to an organized social center.

It would be interesting to have such figures broken down by income, education as well as by age and family status.

The argument has been advanced that this is not an "either-or" relationships and that people may participate in home as well as some center activities and that a good center may attract an increasing number of people. However, as planners, architects and sociologists we have no alternative but to seek the best possible solutions according to the needs and desires of people.

We cannot advocate a community centered neighborhood without considering that multi-nuclei exist, or could exist, and could render a more useful service under certain conditions. We cannot base the size or desirability of the neighborhood on its community centeredness, when evidence does not indicate the wisdom of this attempt. We may, in spite of evidence on use, feel a community center desirable on other grounds and place it in the center of a particular area, repeating it in the next geometrical division. It may be used, and also it may not be whereas a different type of facility would have been desired. We may conclude that several



centers could offer better service of a more specialized nature, in reach of a greater cross-section of the population. Specialized interest is not to be feared since man selectively becomes interested in one or several, but not all, activities and desires to pursue this interest. Facilities should be provided for this, be it foreign films or ceramics.

### Political

If we extend our study to consider political activity to be a criteria of a mentally healthy people (the neighborhood theory intended to serve as a means of increasing political participation by increasing local consciousness), and if we consider voting to be indicative of political participation, we should examine the degree of participation in local and national affairs of residents of neighborhoods - planned and unplanned. It should be borne in mind that this is one index with no variable controlled and there may well be other factors operating beyond a regenerated democratic spirit. Dissatisfaction with local conditions may send people to the polls for local elections.

A study was made of election results in and near Birmingham, England.<sup>1</sup> Birmingham election results seem to indicate an apathy toward political activities. In 1936 only thirty-two percent of the population went to the polls. Year by year, 1921-1936 the newly developed "unplanned" residential areas on the outskirts of

1 - Forgarty, M.P. Town and Country Planning, p.38.

the town polled below the general average, yet in the planned community of Bournville Village, where the village councils had been active, there was a vastly larger representation of voters. Here people were socially alive in spite of the high influx of newcomers to the area. But we must ask what the conditions were there, and we seek to know the characteristics of the population. It is not enough to state that active councils were able to effect this, for it would be helpful to know the constituent elements, the social data. The chief value is in guiding future studies.

Merton's Craftown study, a study of a new, planned community, is of interest.<sup>1</sup> Two-fifth's of the people reported an increase in interest in local politics while one-fifth reported a decrease. When asked what they would do with an extra hour a day, one-quarter of the residents replied "use it in work for a local civic organization." However, a major factor in this response may have been that the only organizations in Craftown were political or civic. In contrast, however, to this response, no one in Middletown answered the question in this way. One-quarter of Craftown's population actually do spend time each week in political activity. About twenty-five percent more of them vote than is the average of the five neighboring communities. This is indicative of political participation in one type of planned community, ie a working class town. It is not possible, however,

- - - -

1 - Merton, Lavanaburg, op.cit.

to generalize from this and say that increased political participation arises from life in a "planned neighborhood type community". It is indicative and suggestive but conclusive only for the particular circumstance of Craftown, particularly if we can consider a recent survey of eleven places in England - including three London County Council estates and two garden cities - found little sense of any personal responsibility for managing the affairs of the community. People's Homes reported:

"When asked whether they liked the neighborhood, less than one percent mentioned any form of activity that involved cooperation with their fellow citizens. The idea of living in a neighborhood appeared virtually to have no connection with any responsibility for its good government in the mind of the average housewife. There was no single reference to political activities, practically none to any local authority, except insofar as it was a landlord, and only a few to various forms of social, cultural and religious activities."

These remarks are of a rather general nature and must be considered as such. It is particularly difficult to evaluate such data which represents another way of life. This lack of feeling of responsibility toward the Estate does not concern the author so much as it does some. He would question what their other activities were, and it may be only that this is indicative that their identification with the neighborhood is less than it is to a larger area.



Room 14-0551  
77 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
Ph: 617.253.2800  
Email: [docs@mit.edu](mailto:docs@mit.edu)  
<http://libraries.mit.edu/docs>

## **DISCLAIMER**

**Page has been omitted due to a pagination error  
by the author.**

pg. 127

Perhaps the place of employment has formed attachments to a larger area; perhaps concern is for the larger area. A sense of responsibility for the government of a neighborhood could be exercised by a participation in a larger area, since no neighborhood exists in vacuo.

Merton found that a previous role of leadership showed itself important in organizational membership, with thirty-five percent of those who had previously been members of political or civic groups taking a hand in initiating organizations, in comparison with fifteen percent without this experience. One-half of those who had been relatively active in political affairs previously, in contrast to seven percent of people without this, helped develop organized action. Affiliation with organizations seems to determine in large measure the choice of friends. Active believers are friends of active believers, with eleven percent of the population being active and forty-five percent of their friends with this view. Membership in groups seemed to alter liberal-illiberal attitudes with ten percent of group members shifting toward the liberal direction and only five percent of the non-members doing likewise. This data is interesting in itself and interesting also in revealing the number of non-active people. It must be remembered that it is specific data, for the type of people of Craftown.

But does the fact of the importance of previous "role of leadership" perhaps point to participation as a personality trait, not related to planned or unplanned neighborhoods.

Psychiatric opinions on this seem in order.

One obvious omission, however, is any reference to participation in national and international affairs. It is fallacious to assume a characteristic "participation" which, if existent, is equally directed toward all types of activity. We must bear in mind Taylor's warning and seek evidence of larger interests among residents of planned neighborhoods:

"Special interest group association which transcend not only local neighborhoods within the confines of any one city, but in their wider aspects, transcend municipal, county, state and even national lines, are integral units of the present day structures of society. Any overemphasis on the values of locality attachments at the expense of these larger interests and loyalties would not only prove undesirable but hopeless, in the light of our highly mobile and increasingly interdependent social order. We are faced with the task of providing adequate plans for greater decentralization of participation and of building a more unified, centralized and better integrated larger national and world-wide community."<sup>1</sup>

### Conclusion

The participation of different groups manifests itself in different patterns. For some people group activity is highly important and is a result of a high degree of selectivity. Other people participate in local or neighborhood affairs. Perhaps a third of the population participates not at all. For some groups facilities for the purposes of groups activities are important and should be provided. If the population composition is shifted, however, to a

<sup>1</sup> - Taylor, W.R. "The Neighborhood Unit Principle in Town Planning". Town Planning Review, July 1938, p.174.

large representation of the non-participants, it seems likely that these same facilities will remain unused, or will draw their support from without the neighborhood. Thus the importance of determining population composition in order to determine the optimum location of facilities is apparent.

## CONCLUSION

It was noted in the introduction, and it may be well to repeat it now, that the author's thesis was directed more towards exploring current theories, and facts concerning their validity; not to develop a new theory of a definitive nature. No excuse need be made, nor indeed be offered for the limited extent of this work. Of for the fact that it has not been possible for the author to reach a precise formula for planning of urban areas. However, definite areas of research have been outlined, as well as some obvious generalizations brought to the attention of the reader.

It must be clear that one of the major tenets of the author has been the fact that the "human equation" must be considered in the moulding of the social structure of people. The difficult task is to find and point out how to create a balance between the physical and social approach. The author also believes and suggests an inductive rather than a deductive approach. The various social factors of a population in a community, area or region should be examined. This will enable the planner to determine the particular human variables in the given area and will result in a firm basis for planning.

This thesis has emphasized the importance that social values should play in the theory of neighborhood structure; it is realized, however, that both physical and social aims must be coordinated to form a coherent whole.

The purpose of any effort should be clear. To the author the purpose of planning residential areas is to achieve the happiest accommodation of people to the area, and of people with themselves within a framework of safety and health. This apparently does not differ from



from the purpose of the neighborhood unit concept, so it is possible to assume that the same end is sought, thus making valid a comparison of means.

We take note that in the neighborhood unit concept the methodology applied is from the physical to the social. To achieve our purpose we must consider a point of departure other than one stemming from physical standards alone. Urban planning may be approached in many ways, with sound methodology we may hope for better planned areas.

The author agrees that the neighborhood unit concept may be applied with success in certain areas, yet all areas do not lend themselves to one method of approach stemming from one point of departure. It is conceivable that the neighborhood unit concept, with a modification of the sub-neighborhood unit structure, might be advocated as ideal for certain areas or for certain groups of people. It is true however, that a priori judgement can not be made without specific reference, nor until there is greater understanding of the many problems already outlined. Any other approach is, in the opinion of the author, hazardous and unscientific. Any attempt to work in a frame of reference which would fit function into a predetermined form will fail, unless there should be a happy set of circumstances which combine to make the solution work. It is a truism to say that every form will not fit every function.

Since we have noted that certain differences exist between the populations of rural areas, and the urban centers, we now point up the

variations in the human equation which we are likely to find between the two, as well as, suggestions in a planning approach for these areas.

#### The Rural Urban Areas.

We find here a population composition that differs markedly from that of the central city. The population is somewhat younger, usually with a higher percentage of married couples particularly of those with children. We also note a lower density, a higher percentage of home-ownership, less mobility, combined these factors form a different pattern of social behaviour in our rural-urban population. We see certain areas of overlapping for all social patterns are not affected by position.

The following points will tend to affect planning in these areas;

1. The income group that is found or that is expected to be found in an area. The higher the income group, the greater will be the need for diversification of facilities, and the more favorable will be the potential for a rather dispersed type of development. On the other hand, with a low income group we are apt to find a low coefficient of mobility with a resulting need for walk-to facilities.
2. The higher the income group, the fewer opportunities there are to form locality ties, and this is indicated by friendship patterns and use of common facilities.

If the planner desires to provide an environment in which the incidence of neighboring will be high, he then should tend toward homogeneity.

Where heterogeneity is found, or expected to be found, he should expect a certain stratification of population. The factors that will define

heterogeneity or homogeneity await further study and clarification.

Some generalizations have been made with regard to this point; they include such points as political, religious, educational, occupational status and the interest orientation of the population. Which of these factors combine to form a desired environment is still in doubt. In this light the author can not point to a definite size for the term neighborhood, but he can say that this size will differ in various areas depending on the population composition and the socio-metric aspects of the situation.

Therefore the two opposites, homogeneity and heterogeneity, will affect the type of neighborhood that will exist. They will affect the facilities that are found, or to be planned into a neighborhood. They will affect the size of the neighborhood, the kind of social pattern that will develop. These are all important factors which point to varied areas, moreover without necessarily a universal type area with a common central focus.

3. Any exact size of a neighborhood must still remain inconclusive, only broad and general frames of reference can be mentioned. However, the previous points we have mentioned will affect and be affected by size.

In an area containing high income groups, the necessity of considering size in terms of walking distance diminishes. In a low income area the converse of the latter statement would be true. To fit the needs of a neighborhood, composed of different family groupings, we should try to form areas of different size to accommodate our heterogeneous population. On the other hand, homogeneous groupings of population will tend, in general, to decrease the size of neighborhood areas.

Heterogeneity or homogeneity will affect service and community facilities in any area, that is heterogeneity will induce overlapping in the use of even planned facilities.

In general we conclude that in so far as we know the human equation to be as variable as it is, each area with which we deal, must be approached as a new and separate problem. We hope that social research will point up norms in the near future, which will give the architect-planner definite universal points of departure in the problems of town planning.

4. As individuals we may feel that there should not be barriers created in the way of mixed ethnic groupings; as planners, engaged in social research, we may find this aim to be attainable only in certain areas. Now this ethnic mixture may be achieved where there is a homogeneity of income and occupation, or education and religion; although the factor of homogeneity is not absolutely defined. Because our emotional maturity has not progressed to the point of tolerance, and understanding, we must treat the desirable goal of free ethnic intermixture within planned areas in a systematic and logical way. This should further the cause of planning, with a view to strengthening planned areas.

If we plan for or find a large ethnic group within a given area, we should expect a certain flavor to be established in that area. If this is located in a rather small area, a neighborhood should be generated because of neighboring patterns and due to the use of common facilities. Finding the same population in a more dispersed situation, the pattern of neighboring will probably seek selectivity on the basis of common ethnic stock. Other factors, however may act in this selectivity, namely education, religion and so forth.

Large Homogeneous areas are felt to be rather undesirable, in as much as small like areas in a heterogeneous whole seem much more likely to provide the healthy environment toward which we are planning. ✓

### The Central City.

The planning of residential areas in the central city differs from that of the peripheral areas. With an increase in city size, will come an increase in the number of stimuli that are offered to the urban dweller. Centers of community interest in the central city will draw participants from a large and amorphous area. The use of local facilities will diminish, from the point of view of active participation, due to the polar attraction of the core. These are essential differences which require a different approach to planning, from that envisioned in the peripheral areas. There might be special cases where a single ethnic group will evolve a cohesive unit, for example as in the North End of Boston, but we must note that it would be the planners's job to determine whether this would still hold true if the economic level of the area in question would rise unevenly creating economic tensions. We feel that the city shows an interplay of specialized interests and services, therefore this raison d'etre of a city should not be destroyed, but made more useful for the population using these services. ✓

The central city differs markedly from the rural urban areas, in that we find marked heterogeneity in the former-particularly in the criteria of family composition. Here the central city encompasses a population cross-section far more complex than we found in the periphery. This added factor, makes the planning process far more difficult to b

direct.

The various population groupings must be dealt with in order that each be provided with the facility or facilities that are of vital interest to them. This is no easy task, and its accomplishment will tax the ingenuity and courage of generations of future planners.

Examples of the direction of our efforts in making our decisions and forming our solutions, will now be offered as a suggestive guide for the planner.

Families with children, living in the central areas, should be provided with adequate play facilities for their children. Their schools could be within walking distance or, alternately with adequate transportation they could be located on the periphery, so that the children could enjoy a change in their environment during part of their active hours.

For single people-there are needs of a different kind- needs which have not as yet been met satisfactorily. For them we see apartment-hotels with an integrated social life, in order to achieve identity with a resulting sense of belonging, which in some instances might be vital for their integration into the city fabric. Here too we will find specialization of interest, and it would no doubt be well to provide separate facilities for the skilled worker apart from facilities made available for the young professional.

The full complexity of planning for the varied social structures of the city is too great to allow thorough analysis here in the conclusion of this thesis. However, we can make a few broad generaliza-

tions, hoping that they will stimulate further study.

Physical facilities that good planning calls for, namely safety, health, and a happy environment for the people, should certainly be provided in neighborhoods of any character. But the question that the author wishes to leave in the mind of the reader is this- "is a neighborhood really necessary for the attainment of these physical features?". It is however suggested that more intensive neighborhoods should be envisioned as the distance from the core increases.

The provision of good housing, safety, and a good environment is not necessarily achieved only by neighborhood planning. Since the population in the central city is different in nature from those of the peripheral areas, it does not seem that "neighborhood" as such is necessary. The author concludes that the most desirable planning is large area planning of small units. Good urban planning, except under special circumstances, may be a mosaic type planning, each unit related to the next, but a network of interdependence and of maximum flexibility. Parks, playgrounds, schools would all be included; where social factors indicate, neighborhoods should be planned. Evidence does seem to indicate, however, that it will be a different neighborhood from that of peripheral areas, and that areas of loyalty, and interest may be small, familiar, neighborhood, from which the next area of association and interest may be a large area of the city.

Flexible, interdependent, overlapping area planning may be the type indicated as most desirable in the central city as our understanding of population characteristics and desires grows. The same approach may be the best response to peripheral needs. Social circumstances

may dictate facility and community centers at varied intervals. Schools may be small and school-centered areas different in size, serving a different population from the recreational and adult education center. There seems no fixed pattern to be advanced. Form will follow function and the varied urban patterns that will arise from, and reflect the varied urban institutions. The integral relationship with physical and social man will be established.

This approach is by no means "the" answer to the problems which have been discussed. Yet the findings have been sufficiently interesting to indicate a new frame of reference within which to work, and by which it is hoped that our future solutions to urban problems will approach their ends more closely. Certain aspects of the social and physical approach may eventually have to be synthesized. This too may be the task of future generations.

The author earlier in this paper devised several hypotheses to direct the study. These arose from the problems which he faced. It cannot be concluded that these hypotheses are proved in fact, although evidence tends to substantiate his original thoughts, indicating a definite trend in the direction which he suggested. The verification of hypotheses about people is difficult and one must be reticent to consider any general laws of behavior unequivocally true. However, regardless of conclusions about specific hypotheses, the evidence does show that an approach based on the human equation is in fact necessary, and anything short of that will only be a partial solution to our problems.



## AREAS OF FUTURE RESEARCH

It is pertinent, at this point, to indicate areas or research that seem to call for more detailed study, analysis and integration-leading to a more inclusive use of neighborhood theories.

1. How important does the physically adjacent primary group remain; to what group or groups is it of particular importance? What social effect has a widely dispersed primary group produced? Is there a direct causal relationship to social disorganization? Is the locational factor of a primary group a determinant of its effectiveness?

2. What are possible ideological results of strong neighborhood groups? The answer to this will determine the potential static or dynamic qualities to be expected in neighborhood living.

3. For what groups is community centeredness important? Which groups will it affect at all, even if determined to be desirable? How can it be effectuated?

4. Activities which are likely to be shaped directly by factors of proximity or convenience, these to be provided within a definite geographical unit, must be determined. Conversely, those activities in which personal selectivity dominates must also be determined so that they not be misplaced.

5. The relationship of the ratio of physical density to social density must be clearly understood.

6. The needs of non-child neighborhoods should be studied. Thus far attention has been primarily directed toward the child area.

7. The amount of integration of a city should be determined; the area, in size and population capable of functioning as a unit should be determined.

8. Attempts should be made to find whether social disorganization is the result of (a) urban environment or (b) a concomitant of the disorganization of our times.

9. Attempts should be made to isolate the causes of social disorganization characteristic of our cities. We cannot continue to ascribe it to an undefined "effect of urban living".

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brownell, Baker. The Human Community: Its Philosophy and Practice.
- Burgess, Ernest W. The Urban Community. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926.
- Bruner, E.S. Community Organization and Adult Education: A Five Year Experiment. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942.
- Branch, Melvin. Urban Planning and Public Opinion. Princeton: The Bureau of Urban Research, 1942.
- Bauer, Catherine. "Good Neighborhoods". Annals of the American Political Science Association, November 1945, pp.104-115.
- Bauer, Catherine. Some Notes on Social Research re Community Planning. mimeographed form.
- Cantril, Hadley. The "Why" of Man's Experience. New York: The Macmillan C 1950.
- Caplow, Theodore and Forman, Robert. "Neighborhood Interaction in a Homogeneous Community". American Sociological Review, 15:3, June 1950, p.357.
- Carpenter, H. Daniel. The Neighborhood: Grass Roots of American Democracy.
- Carpenter, Nils. Sociology of City Life.
- Chapin, F. Stuart. "Effects of Slum Clearance and Rehousing on Family and Community Relations". American Journal of Sociology, 43:5, 744-763.
- Chapin, F. Stuart. "An Experiment in the Social Effects of Good Housing". American Sociological Review, 5:6, December 1940.
- Cooley, C.H. Social Organization. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.
- Coyle, \_\_, \_\_. "Belonging", in American City, August 1941, 56:8, 71-73.
- Dahir, James. The Neighborhood Unit Plan: Its Spread and Acceptance. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1947.
- Dawson, C.A., and Gettys, W.E. An Introduction to Sociology.
- Deutsch, M. and Collins, M.E. Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment. The University of Minnesota Press, 1951.
- Dewey, Richard. "The Neighborhood, Urban Ecology and City Planners." American Sociological Review, 15:4, 502.

Dickinson, Robert E. "The Social Factor in City Planning". Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Summer, 1946, 5-10.

Durant, Ruth. Watling: A Social Survey. London: P.S. King and Son, 1939.

Fawcett, C.B. A Residential Unit for Town and Country Planning. London: University of London Press, 1944.

Festinger, \_\_\_\_\_. Social Pressures in Informal Groups.

Foley, Donald. "The Use of Local Facilities in a Metropolis." American Journal of Sociology, 56:3, 238-246.

Form, William H. "Status Stratification in a Planned Community". American Sociological Review, 10, 605-613.

Fogarty, M.P. Town and Country Planning. Hutchison's University Library, 1949.

Gibbard, Harold. The Status Factor in Residential Successions.

Glick, Paul C. "The Family Cycle". American Sociological Review, April 1947, 164.

Glass, Ruth. Social Background of a Plan: Study of Middlesbrough. London, 1948.

Gropius, Walter. "Organic Neighborhood". Housing and Town and Country Planning Bulletin, April 1949.

Hawley, Ames H. Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure. The Ronald Press, New York, 1950.

Hudson, Robert B. Radburn: A Plan of Living. American Association for Adult Education, New York, 1934.

Isaacs, R. "The Neighborhood Concept." Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 14:2, 15-23.

Isaacs, R. "Educational, Cultural and Recreational Services to Increase Participation in Community Life." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, Vol. 242, November 1945, 129-138.

Jevans, R., and Madge, C. Housing Estates: A Study of Bristol Corporation Policy and Practice Between the Wars.

Komarovsky, Mirra. "The Voluntary Associations of Urban Dwellers." American Sociological Review, 11, December 1948, 687-696.

King, C. Wendell. "Social Cleavage in a New England Community". Social Forces, 24, 322ff.

Klößler, E. "Walled Towns or Neighborhoods". Journal of the American Institute of Planners, April, May, June, 1946, Vol. 12.

Kligman, Miriam. "Human Ecology and the City Planning Movement." Social Forces, Vol. 24, 89ff.

MacIver, R.M. Community: A Sociological Study, Macmillan and Company, London, 1936.

MacIver, R.M. Society: Its Structure and Changes. Ray Long and Richard R. Smith, New York, 1931.

McKenzie, R.D. "The Neighborhood". American Journal of Sociology, 27, p.145,344,486,588,780.

McClenahan, B.A. "The Communitality: The Urban Substitute for the Traditional Community". Sociology and Social Research, 30, March-April 1946, 264-274.

Merton, Robert. "The Social Psychology of Housing" in Current Trends in Social Psychology, Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1948.

Merton, Robert. The Lamansburg-Columbia Research on Human Relations: Human Relations in the Planned Community, An Interim Report. 1946.

Madge, C. "Planning for People". Town Planning Review, July 1950, 131ff.

Midland City, Wolverhampton: Social and Industrial Survey. London, 1948.

Owen, Mary. Survey of a Neighborhood: Study of Pigeon Hill in Bloomington, Indiana. 1936. Master's thesis, University of Indiana.

Perry, Clarence. "Neighborhood and Community Planning", Monograph No.1 in Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs, Vol. VII. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1929.

Perry, Clarence. Housing for the Machine Age. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1939.

Park, Robert E. "The City: Suggestion for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the City Environment". American Journal of Sociology, 20:5, March, 1915.

Queen, S.A. and Thomas, L.F. The City. McGraw Hill, New York, 1939.

Queen, S.A., Bodenhofer, Walter and Harper, Ernest. Social Organization and Disorganization. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1935.

Riemer, S. "Hidden dimensions of neighborhood planning". Land Economics, 26:2, 197-201.

Snedden, David. "Communities, Associate and Federate". American Journal of Sociology, 28, 681ff.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Society and Environment" in Town and Country Planning Textbook.

Sorokin, P. Social Mobility. New York: Harper's, 1927.

Sorokin, P. Contemporary Sociological Theories. New York: Harper's, 1938.

Sorokin, P. and Berger, C.Q. Time Budgets of Human Behavior. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Sorokin, P. Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology.

Steiner, J.F. Community Organization. New York: D. Appleton Century Co., 1930.

Steiner, J.F. Community in Action. New York, 1928.

Stein, Clarence. "City of the Future - a City of Neighborhoods". American City, November 1945, 476-483.

Stein, Clarence. New Towns for America.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Stranger in the City". American Journal of Sociology, 56:7, 476-483.

Stollman, Israel. Neighborhood Planning in Washington Square. Master's Thesis in City Planning, MIT, 1948.

Sweetser, Frank. Neighborhood Acquaintance and Association. Ph.D. thesis, Columbia University, 1941.

Tannebaum, J. "The Neighborhood: A Socio-Psychological Analysis". Land Economics, November 1948, 358-369.

Taylor, W.R. "The Neighborhood Unit Principle in Town Planning". Town Planning Review, July 1939, 174-186.

Ware, Caroline F. Greenwich Village, 1920-1930. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1935.

Warner, W. Lloyd and Lunt, Paul S. The Social Life of a Modern Community. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.

White, L.E. Tenement Town. London: Jason Press, 1946.

Winston, Sanford. Social Aspects of Public Housing: An Evaluation of a North Carolina Experience, 1947.

Zimmerman, Carle C. The Changing Community. New York: Harper's, 1938.

also

Anderson, W.A. "The Family and Individual Social Participation". American Sociological Review, 8:420ff, and 8:721ff. August and December 194

Bushee, Frederick A. "Social Organizations in a Small City". American Journal of Sociology. 2, November 1945, 217ff.

Coyle, Frace. Social Process in Organized Groups. New York: Richard R. Smith, 1930.

Dinwiddie, Courtenay. Community Responsibility: A Review of the Cincinnati Social Unit Experiment. New York: New York School of Social Work, 1921.

Demerath, N.J. "Ecology - Framework for City Planning". Social Forces, 26:1, October 1947.

Diamond, Walter. "On the Dangers of an Urban Interpretation of History", in Historiography and Urbanization, ed. by Eric F. Goldman. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1941.

Firey, Walter. Land Use in Central Boston. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Hatt, Paul. "The Concept of Natural Areas." American Sociological Review, 11: August 1946, 423-427.

McClenahan, B.A. Changing Urban Neighborhood from Neighbor to Nigh-Dweller.

McKenzie, R.D. The Metropolitan Community. McGraw Hill, New York, 1933.

Rodwin, L.L. "Garden Cities and the Metropolis". Journal of Land and Public Utilities Economics, August 1945, pp.268-281.

Schlesinger, Arthur. "The City in American History". Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 27:1, June 1940.

Tibbits, Chrk. "A Study of Chicago Settlements and Their Districts". Social Forces, 6:430-437.

Wood, A.E. "The Place of the Community in Sociological Studies." American Sociology Society, 22:14-25.

Zorbaugh, E.V. Gold Coast.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Social Integration of American Cities of More than 100,000". American Sociological Review, 12:3, 335-342.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Neighborhood Unit Planning: An Adequate Theory?" Journal of the Israel Town Planning Association, Winter, 1951, 1, 2.